

UNIVERSITY OF BABYLON

**Investigating the Difficulties
Encountered by Iraqi EFL
University Students in Using
Nominal Affixes**

A Thesis

Submitted to the Council of the College of Basic
Education, University of Babylon in Partial
Fulfilment of the Requirements for the Degree of
Master of Education in Methods of Teaching
English as a Foreign Language

by

EQBAL KHUDHEYER HASHIM

Supervised by

Asst. Prof.
Riyadh Tariq Al-Ameedi
(Ph.D.)

Lecturer
A'sim Abood Al-Dulaimy
(Ph.D.)

Rajab 1426

August 2005

بِسْمِ اللَّهِ الرَّحْمَنِ الرَّحِيمِ

﴿ وَمِنْ آيَاتِهِ خَلْقَ السَّمَوَاتِ وَالْأَرْضِ وَ
اِخْتَلَفَ الْأَسْنَتَكُمْ وَالْوَنُكُمُ إِنَّ فِي ذَلِكَ لَآيَاتٍ

لِلْعَالَمِينَ ﴾

صدق الله العظيم

سورة الروم/الآية (٢٢)

We certify that this thesis, entitled “**Investigating the Difficulties Encountered by Iraqi EFL University Students in Using Nominal Affixes**” was prepared by “**Eqbal Khudheyer Hashim**” under our supervision at the College of Basic Education, University of Babylon, as partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Education in Methods of Teaching English as a Foreign Language.

Signature:

Name: Asst.Prof.Riyadh Tariq
Al-Ameedi (Ph.D.)

(Supervisor)

Date: / / 2005

Signature:

Name: Lecturer. A'sim Abood
Al-Dulaimy (Ph.D.)

(Supervisor)

Date: / / 2005

In view of the available recommendations, I forward this thesis for debate by the Examining Committee.

Signature:

Name: **Asst. Prof. Dr. Abdul Sattar Mahdi Ali**
Head of the Department of Higher Studies,
College of Basic Education, University of Babylon
Date: / / 2005

We certify that we have read this thesis, entitled “ **Investigating the Difficulties Encountered by Iraqi EFL University Students in Using Nominal Affixes**”, and as examining committee, examined the student “**Eqbal Khudheyer Hashim**” in its contents and in our opinion it is adequate as a thesis for the degree of Master of Education in Methods of Teaching English as a Foreign Language.

Signature:

Name:

(Member)

Date: / / 2005

Signature:

Name:P

(Member)

Date: / / 2005

Signature:

Name:

(Chairman)

Date: / / 2005

Approved by the Council of the College of Basic Education

Signature:

Name: **Asst. Prof. Dr. Abbas Ubied Hammadi**

Dean of the College of Basic Education

University of Babylon

Date: / / 2005

TO

My Dear Mother

Acknowledgements

Cardinal thanks and deepest gratitude go to my supervisors Asst. Prof. Riyadh Tariq Al-Ameedi (Ph.D.) and Lecturer. A'sim Abood Al-Dulaimy (Ph.D.) whose patience, cooperation and constructive suggestions helped me to carry out this work.

I am greatly indebted to the members of jury especially Asst. Prof. Mr. Adil Al-Akkam, Head of the Department of English, College of Basic Education, University of Babylon for his fatherly care, and continuous encouragement.

I am also greatly indebted to Prof. Dr.Salih Mahdy Hameed, Asst. Prof. Dr. Hameed Hassoon and Lecturer Dr. Fareed Al-Hindawi from the College of Education, University of Babylon for their valuable advice and encouragement.

My deepest thanks and gratitude are due to Asst. Prof. Miss Shatha Al-Saadi from the College of Education for Women, University of Baghdad.

I sincerely thank the librarians who are in charge of the library of the College of Basic Education, University of Babylon for their help.

Finally, my warmest and deepest gratitude and love are due to my family for their continuous help, care, and support throughout this work.

Abstract

This study is mainly concerned with English nominal affixes. Affixes are classified according to their position into three types: prefixes, infixes and suffixes.

The Iraqi learners of English as a foreign language may not have a full mastery of English nominal affixes, therefore, this study aims at investigating their ability to recognize and use nominal affixes. It is hypothesized that:

- 1- Most of Iraqi EFL college students do not often distinguish nominal affixes from other affixes.
- 2- As for inflectional nominal suffixes, such learners face difficulties in making pluralization. Moreover, they are unable to make the necessary morphological changes in order to avoid incorrect spelling.
- 3- The students' performance in deriving nouns in context is expected to be better than their performance out-of-context, i.e., words in isolation.
- 4- The students' achievement at the recognition level is expected to be better than their achievement at the production one.

In order to verify these hypotheses, a diagnostic test is applied to a sample of 150 Iraqi EFL third year college students from the Department of English, College of Education. This sample was selected equally and randomly from three universities: Babylon, Baghdad and Al-Qadissiya to make a good representative sample in an attempt to obtain genuine results. The statistical and linguistic analysis of the subjects' responses to the items of the test yields the following conclusions:

- 1-Iraqi EFL college students face difficulties in recognizing and producing nominal affixes as the highest rate of their responses is

incorrect (**62.09 %**). But they face more difficulty at the production level as the rate of their correct responses is (**31.50%**) against (**47.6%**) for their correct responses at the recognition level.

2- As for inflectional suffixes, the high rate of the subjects' incorrect responses (**66.87%**) reveals the subjects' incompetence in using such suffixes in pluralization. The other rate (**68.56%**) reflects their deficiency to avoid incorrect spelling.

3- The subjects' performance in producing nouns in context (**38.47%**) is better than that of isolated items (**22.79%**).

4- The subjects' errors are attributed to the following strategies which are hierarchically arranged:

I. Communication strategies (**44.90%**).

II. Intralingual transfer (**44.81%**).

III. Context of learning (**7.58%**).

V- Interlingual negative interference (**2.71%**).

This study comprises five chapters, the first of which is devoted to the discussion of the problem, aims, hypotheses, procedures, limit and value of the study. Chapter two is a theoretical survey of nominal affixes including their definitions, types and functions. Chapter three presents a description of the test administered to the third year EFL college students, Department of English, College of Education, Universities of Babylon, Baghdad and Al-Qadissiya. This description includes the objectives of the test, its design, material selection, validity, reliability, subjects and scoring scheme adopted. Chapter four outlines the results of the test. The subjects' errors are analyzed and identified. Finally, chapter five summarizes the conclusions arrived at in this study, on the bases of which some pedagogical implications are given and some topics for further research are suggested.

List of Tables

<i>No.</i>	<i>Table</i>	<i>Page</i>
1	Possessive Forms of Pronouns	25
2	The Facility Value and the Discrimination Index of the Items	56
3	Distribution of the Scores of the Test	59
4	Subjects' Performance at the Recognition Level of Question (1)	61
5	Errors Made in Response of Question (1)	62
6	Subjects' Performance at the Recognition Level of Question (2)	64
7	Errors Made in Response to Question (2)	65
8	Subjects' Total Performance at the Recognition Level of Questions (1 and 2)	66
9	Subjects' Performance at the Production Level of Question (3)	67
10	Errors Made in Response to Question (3)	67
11	Subjects' Performance at the Production Level of Question (4)	70
12	Errors Made in Response to Question (4)	70
13	Subjects' Performance at the Production Level of Question (5)	73
14	Errors Made in Response to Question (5)	75
15	Subjects' Performance at the Production Level of Questions (4 and 5)	76
16	Subjects' Performance at the Production Level of Questions (3, 4 and 5)	76

17	Subjects' Performance at the Recognition and Production Levels of the Whole Test	77
18	Errors Made due to the Intralingual Strategies	88
19	Errors Made due to the Risk-Taking Strategy	94
20	Errors Made due to the Communication Strategies	96
21	Errors Made due to the Language Learning and Communication Strategies	96

Abbreviations

Symbol	Description
CSs	Communication Strategies
CRs	Correct Responses
CRTs	Criterion-Referenced Tests
IRs	Incorrect Responses
L1	First Language
L2	Second Language
NAs	Nominal Affixes
NP	Noun Phrase
★	unacceptable
—	stands for the nominal inflection
→	stands for the nominal derivation
/ /	slants are used to enclose phonemic elements
[]	brackets are used to enclose phonetic elements
{ }	brackets are used to enclose morphological elements

Contents

<i>Subject</i>	<i>Page</i>
<i>Chapter One : Introduction</i>	
1.1. The Problem	1
1.2. Aims of the Study	2
1.3. Hypotheses	2
1.4. Procedures	3
1.5. Limits of the Study	3
1.6. Value of the Study	4
<i>Chapter Two : Nominal Affixes</i>	
2.1. Introduction	5
2.2. Nominalization	6
2.3. Word Formation Processes of Nouns	11
2.3.1. Nominal Prefixation	11
2.3.1.1. Nominal Negative Prefixes	12
2.3.1.2. Reversitive Prefixes	13
2.3.1.3. Pejorative Prefixes	13
2.3.1.4. Prefixes of Degree	14
2.3.1.5. Prefixes of Orientation	15
2.3.1.6. Locative Prefixes	16
2.3.1.7. Prefixes of Time	17
2.3.1.8. Prefixes of Number	18
2.3.1.9. Miscellaneous Neo-Classical Prefixes	19
2.3.2. Nominal Suffixation	20
2.3.2.1. Nominal Inflectional Suffixes	20
2.3.2.1.1. Plural Suffixes	21

2.3.2.1.2. Possessive Suffixes	24
2.3.2.2. Nominal Derivational Suffixes	27
2.3.2.2.1. Denominal Nouns : Abstract	27
2.3.2.2.2. Denominal Nouns : Concrete	29
2.3.2.2.3. Deverbal Nouns	30
2.3.2.2.4. De-Adjectival Nouns	34
2.3.2.2.5. Noun / Adjective Suffixes	35
2.3.3. Nominal Conversion	35
2.3.3.1. Deverbal Nouns	37
2.3.3.2. De-Adjectival Nouns	39
2.3.3.3. Minor Categories of Conversion to Nouns	39
2.3.3.4. Change of Secondary Word Class : Nouns	40
2.3.3.5. Conversion with Formal Modifications	42
<i>Chapter Three : Data Collection</i>	
3.1. Introduction	45
3.2. Objectives of the Test	45
3.3 The Need for the Language Test	46
3.4. Description of the Test	47
3.4.1. The Rationale of the Test	47
3.4.2. The Content of the Test	49
3.5. Validity	51
3.6. Reliability	52
3.7 The Subjects	53
3.8. Pilot Administration	54
3.8.1. Item Analysis	54
3.9. Final Administration	57
3.10. Scoring Scheme	58

<i>Chapter Four : Data Analysis and Results</i>	
4.1. Introduction	60
4.2. Discussion of the Results	60
4.2.1. Subjects' Performance in the First Question	60
4.2.2. Subjects' Performance in the Second Question	63
4.2.3. Subjects' Performance in the Third Question	66
4.2.4. Subjects' Performance in the Fourth Question	69
4.2.5. Subjects' Performance in the Fifth Question	72
4.2.6. Subjects' Performance in Nominal Affixes of the Whole Test	76
4.3. Sources of Errors	78
4.3.1. Language Learning Strategies	79
4.3.1.1. Interlingual Transfer	79
4.3.1.2. Intralingual Transfer	83
4.3.1.3. Context of Learning	89
4.3.2. Communication Strategies	91
4.3.2.1. Risk-Avoidance Strategies	91
4.3.2.2. Risk-Taking Strategies	92
4.3.2.3. Guessing	95
<i>Chapter Five :Coclusions, Recommendations and Suggestions</i>	
5.1. Introduction	97
5.2. Practical Conclusions	97
5.3. Pedagogical Implications Recommendations	99
5.4. Suggestions for Further Work	101
Bibliography	102
Appendix I	112
Appendix II	116

Chapter One
Introduction

Chapter one

Introduction

1.1. The Problem

Iraqi learners of English may not develop a full mastery of the English nominal affixes. The problem arises from using nominal derivational affixes which change the class of the words into nouns because of the great arbitrariness of some of these affixes. Iraqi learners of English as a foreign language (henceforth EFL) college students may not distinguish such affixes from those which form adjectives or verbs. Al-Kawaz (2002:viii) points out: “The Iraqi students face difficulty in producing nouns because of the arbitrariness and non-productivity of the process of nominalization, therefore, the subjects resort to gerundive nominals more frequently than derived nominals.” Broukal (2003:174) states: “The type of nominal derivational suffixes is the most common type of error tested in the written expression section of the TOEFL.”

In addition to that, there are certain affixes which are used to produce nouns as well as adjectives: **{-al, -ing, -y, -ful}**:

arrive → arrival

learn → learning

jealous → jealousy

month → monthful

There are necessary changes in spelling which should be made in order to produce correct nominal forms:

lazy → laziness

invite → invitation

knife → knives

story → stories

As for nominal inflectional affixes the Iraqi learners are not master such affixes as in irregular plural.

1.2. Aims of the Study

In connection with the preceding statements, the study aims at:

- 1- Investigating the mastery of Iraqi EFL college students in recognizing and producing NAs.
- 2- Finding out the causes of the students' errors so that some solutions can be posited to help them overcome the problems they face in using such affixes.

1.3. Hypotheses

In view of the preceding aims, it is hypothesized that:

- 1- Most of Iraqi EFL college students do not distinguish nominal affixes from other affixes.
- 2- As for inflectional nominal suffixes with irregular forms, such learners face difficulties in pluralization, they do not make the necessary changes in spelling.

- 3- The students' performance in forming nouns in context is expected to be better than their performance out of context, i.e., words in isolation.
- 4- The students' achievement on the recognition level is expected to be better than their achievement on the production one.

1.4. Procedures

The steps to be followed in carrying out the research will include:

- 1- Presenting, as far as possible, a comprehensive description of English NAs which can be of help to recognize the types and functions of such affixes..
- 2- Selecting a sample of Iraqi EFL college students as subjects for administering a test to point out the difficulties that they may encounter in using NAs.
- 3- Carrying out a statistical analysis of the students' responses.
- 4- Analyzing the results of the test, on the basis of which conclusions and pedagogical recommendations can be arrived at.

1.5. Limits of the Study

The present study will be limited to English NAs. The sample of the study is confined to college students at their third stage in the Department of English, College of Education at three Universities: Babylon, Baghdad and Al-Qadissiya during the academic year (2004-2005). The third year students have been chosen because the topic under investigation is taught in the second and third years respectively.

1.6. Value

The findings of the present study are hoped to be useful in two aspects:

1- Theoretically, the study provides information about NAs which can be advantageous for the researchers as it can pave the way for further investigation on this topic.

2-Practically, it has a pedagogical value to teachers in that it can provide insights into the problematic areas concerning NAs, which can be of use to them in their efforts to help learners perform more effectively. This study can also be of some help to syllabus designers as it can serve for the preparation of remedial teaching programmes.

Chapter Two
Nominal
Affixes

Chapter Two

Nominal Affixes

2.1. Introduction

Nominal Affixes are always bound morphemes which, in contrast with free morphemes, cannot normally stand alone, but are typically attached to other forms; e.g.: {**re-**, **-ist**, **-ation**, **-s**, etc }.

The morpheme is the smallest meaningful unit in the structure of a language (Nida, 1944:4). According to Stageberg (1971:83) the morpheme meets three criteria:

- 1- It is a word or a part of a word that has meaning.
- 2- It cannot be divided into smaller meaningful parts without violation of its meaning or without meaningless reminders.
- 3- It recurs in differing verbal environments with a relatively stable meaning .

Affixes are viewed as lexical entries that combine with lexemes in a combinatorial fashion. As lexical entries, affixes are assigned phonological, semantic, and categorical properties. By virtue of their selectional restrictions, they combine with lexemes forming complex configurations (Leiber, 1980:5) and (Disciullo and Williams 1987:22).

An affix is a bound morpheme that occurs before or within or after a base. Affixation is a cover term, which generalizes over prefixation, suffixation, infixation, and supra. They create different things (Johnson, 2002:1).

2.2 Nominalization

Nominalization, the creation of nouns from other categories, is the most common kind of derivational morphology in English. It is defined by Crystal (1991:260) as “the process of forming a noun from other word-class”

arrive → arrival

close → closure

happy → happiness

poor → poverty

The term nominalization can be applied to a noun phrase (henceforth NP) which has a systematic correspondence with a clause structure, the head noun of such a phrase is normally related morphologically to a verb or to an adjective:

He **refuses** to help ~ His **refusal** to help

Her statement is **true** ~The **truth** of her statement(Quirk *et al*, 1985:1288)

When you **arrive** at your hotel, please write to me ~

On **arrival** at your hotel, please write to me (Close, 1975:101)

The term nominalization may be applied to NP with an agential noun head:

She **writes** well ~ She is a good **writer**

He **lies** cleverly ~ He is a clever **liar** (Quirk *et al*, 1985: 1289)

The relation between a nominalization and a corresponding clause structure can be more or less explicit, according to how far the nominalization specifies the nominal or adverbial elements of a corresponding clause through the use of modifiers and determinative:

The reviewers criticized his play **in a hostile manner** (ibid)

The reviewers' **hostile criticizing** of his play (ibid)

The reviewers' **criticism** of his play (ibid)

Some verbs have no corresponding deverbal noun. For example, corresponding to **lie, tell untruth**, there is no deverbal abstract noun although there is the agential noun **liar**. In such cases, however, we can usually make use of a verbal noun ending with **{-ing}** (ibid).

Lying is all too common

Learning English is not easy (Ackert,2002:214)

I enjoy **shopping** (Murphy, 2002:106)

Nouns are open-class words because new items are constantly being created and no one can make a list of all nouns in English and can be confident that it was complete. So the open class is indefinitely extendable.

According to Frank (1972:1) ; (Selkirk, 1982:12); Chalkier (1984:20); (Toman, 1985:6); (Ackert, 2002:213) and (Broukal, 2003:134). Joffrey (2003:6) and Plag (2003:22) nouns have the following properties:

1-Formal or morphological properties:

A-Inflectional ending {-s} for plural and {'s} or {s'} for possession

B-Derivation endings {-ment}, {-nce}, {-th}, {-ness}, etc.

2-Positional or distributional properties:

Nouns appear in similar positions in the sentence, they can be preceded immediately by determiners:

his ability such happiness

the agreement my absence

3-Functional properties:

Nouns can fit into certain functional slots and they can be identified by their position and function in a sentence. So they can be subject, direct object and object of a preposition

4-Semantic properties:

For grammatical and semantic reasons, nouns can be seen as falling into different sub-classes:

A-mass vs. count

B-concrete vs. abstract

As for gerund can be used as nouns. The term “**gerund**” comes from Latin “**gerundium**” derived from “**gerere**” which means, “to bear” (Chambers English Dictionary (henceforth CED), 1989:595).

Fitikides (2002:31) mentions the use of the gerund as a noun:

1- After prepositions

He works without **stopping**

They were accused of **having** ignored the environment.

(Poesio,2000:10)

He thought about **joining** the Foreign Legion

(Johannesson,1999:2)

2- After words which regularly take prepositions such as: **fond of, insist on, tired of, succeed in.**

I’m tired of **doing** the work again

(Fitikides,2002:31)

3- After certain verbs, such as: **avoid, enjoy, finish, stop, like, love, start, continue.**

They enjoy **playing** football

I don’t like **writing** letters

4- After certain adjectives: **busy, worth, good, bad, etc.**

Lena was busy **writing** a book

5- After certain phrases: **would you mind, what about, etc.**

Would you mind **opening** the door?

The subject of a gerund may be omitted or it may appear in either the object or possessive case:

It was no good **trying** to calm him (Zandvoort, 1966:31)

It's no good **our thinking** about building a house (West, 1961:24)

The gerund is distinguished from the past participle, but some grammarians, such as Nesfield and Wood (1964:74), Brown and Miller (1980:68) and Crystal (1991:279) show that they are different in nature because the gerund functions as a noun, whereas the participle functions as an adjective:

Working in these conditions is pleasure (gerund: subject)

(Eckersley and Eckersley, 1960:243)

Swimming in the lake is not allowed (Kies, 1995:4)

Winning is important (subject) (Gethin, 1983:98)

I heard some **surprising** news (object) (Azar, 1999:297)

Bob gives up **smoking** (object) (Shepherd *et al*, 1991:21)

I enjoy **traveling** (Pollock, 1950:262)

The gerundival clause can modify the verb, or the whole sentence.

They observed Adrian **writing** his book (Curme, 1953:189)

On **seeing** her, he ran to meet her (ibid)

2.3. Word Formation Processes of Nouns

Word formation is the study and description of morphologically complex words (Plag, 2003:22). Word formation rules are of limited rather than general productivity. Some are still productive as in the genital suffix **{-er}**, other fossilized as in the genital suffix **{-ar}** and they have a somewhat arbitrary application to particular stems, such as the rule forming noun plurals which are generally productive and of wide application (Brown and Miller, 1980:225).

There is an area in which grammar and lexicology share a common ground, where generalizations, as in grammar, are appropriate. This area is word formation, there are regularities of a similar nature in grammar and word-formation and there are cases in which the two sets of regularities are directly connected :

She **delegated** the work speedily → Her **delegation** of the work speedily
(Quirk *et al*, 1985:37)

2.3.1. Nominal Prefixation

A prefix is an element which is placed at the front of a word. In English, prefixes add something to the meaning of a word, but they do not usually change its word class. The vast majority of prefixes in English are class-maintaining (Bauer, 1983:216); (Broukal,2003:136) and (Matthieson, 2003:23).

In this respect, nine types of nominal prefixes can be distinguished:

2.3.1.1 Nominal Negative Prefixes

There are many negative prefixes of nouns. Grammarians such as Quirk et al (1985:1545) state that the function of these prefixes is to modify meanings of stems.

1- **{a-}**, **{an-}**, (especially before vowel), lacking in, is found in some nouns. Some items have the main stress on the prefix:

'anarchy 'atheist (Quirk *et al*, 1985:1546)

2- **{dis-}**, not, combines with open-class items including nouns:

disorder disuse discontent disinformation (Bauer, 1983: 220)

disappearance disbenefit (Graham, 1982:189)

distaste disease (Al-Hamash and Jamal 1979:100)

3-**{in-}**, not, combines (sometimes hyphenated) with nouns:

inattention incapacity inutility

in-joke in-language in-state (Bauer, 1983:219)

4- **{non-}**, not, combines (usually hyphenated) with nouns:

non-smoker non-finite non-sentence

nonstop nonsense (Thomas,2002:60)

2.3.1.2. Reversitive Prefixes

This type refers to the opposite form, state, condition or direction of the nouns:

{**De-**}, reversing the action, combines fairly with deverbal nouns:

denationalization decomposition
defrost decentralization (Shammas, 1999:9)

2.3.1.3. Pejorative Prefixes

These prefixes refer to the disparaging and depreciating forms of nouns:

1- {**mal-**}, bad, combines with abstract nouns:

malfunction malnutrition.

2- {**mis-**}, wrongly, astray, combines with abstract nouns:

misconduct mispronunciation
misbelief misuse. (Graham, 1982:189)

3- {**Pseudo-**}, false and imitation, combines freely with nouns:

pseudo-Christianity pseudo-classicism.
pseudo-linguist pseudo-realist

(Al-Hamash and Jamal, 1979:103)

2.3.1.4. Prefixes of Degree

The purpose behind using this type of prefixes is to show the degree of size, quality, or quantity of nouns: 1- **{arch-}**, supreme, most. This prefix is added particularly to human nouns to denote an extreme or pre-eminent person:

archduke archbishop arch-exponent

arch monetarist (Bauer, 1983:218).

2- **{co-}**, jointly, or equal footing, combines freely with nouns:

co-education co-pilot co-habit

co-religionist co-author (ibid)

3- **{mini-}**, little, combines freely with nouns. This prefix is very

productive:

mini-market mini-skirt mini-cab

minidress minicomputer miniwar minipill (ibid)

4- **{out-}**, surpassing, combines freely with nouns (with prefix stressed):

'outnumber 'outclass (Shammas, 1999:181)

5- **{super-}**, more than, very special, on top, hierarchically superior,

combines freely with nouns (with prefix stressed):

'supermarket 'superman 'superstructure

'superhuman (Al-Hamash and Jamal, 1979:115)

6- **{sur-}**, over and above, combines with nouns and takes the stress:

'surcharge 'surtax

7- **{ultra-}**, extreme, beyond, combines with nouns in technical usage, some times with the prefix stressed:

'ultrasound 'ultracentrifuge

8- **{under-}**, too little, combines with nouns:

underprovision

It is used with the meaning: subordinate; it combines less

commonly with nouns:

undermanager

2.3.1.5. Prefixes of Orientation

This type shows the opinion towards something:

1-**{anti-}**, against, combines freely with nouns:

anti-war anti-missile antisocialism (Richards et al, 1993:43)

anticlimax anti-Semite (Al-Hamash and Jamal,1979:101)

2- **{contra-}**, opposite, contrasting, combines with nouns with stress on the prefix:

'contradistinction 'contra-flow

'contradict (Shammas,1999:179)

3- **{counter-}**, against, in opposition to, combines with abstract nouns

with main stress on the prefix:

'counter-revolution 'counterculture

'countereffect 'counterstrike (Buar,1983:218)

This prefix still seems to be extremely productive:
counter culture counter effect counter strike (ibid:220)

4- **{pro-}**, for, on the side of, combines freely with nouns:

pro-communist pro-student

pro-consul (Quirk et al, 1985:1547)

2.3.1.6. Locative Prefixes

These, like spatial prepositions, may extend their meaning metaphorically to abstract spheres. In nominalization of verbs along with their accompanying particles, the locative particles, are frequently prefixed and stressed (Quirk *et al*, 1985:1543). In this respect, five types of locative prefixes can be distinguished:

1- **{fore-}**, front part of, front, combines freely with nouns:

'forearm 'forename 'foreleg

'foreground 'forepart 'foreshore

(Al-Hamash and Jamal, 1979:103)

2- **{inter-}**, between, among, combines freely with nouns. The product is chiefly used in premodification:

'inter-war 'inter-school

'interdependence (Bauer,1983:220)

3- **{sub-}**, under, combines freely with nouns:

'subsection 'subway

'subwarden (ibid)

4- **{super-}**, above, combines rather frequently with nouns:

'superstructure 'superscript (Quirk et al, 1985:1543)

5- **{trans-}**, across, from one place to another, combines with nouns with initial stress:

'transport 'transatlantic

'transcontinent (Shammas,1999:180)

2.3.1.7. Prefixes of Time

These prefixes deal with time:

1- **{ex-}**, former, combines freely with chiefly human nouns:

ex-president ex-serviceman ex-wife

ex-husband ex-convict (ibid)

2- **{fore-}**, before, combines freely with nouns:

foreknowledge foreshadow foreground

forelook forman (Quirk et al, 1985:1544)

3- **{post-}**, after, combines freely with nouns (mainly as pre modifiers):

post-war post-election

4- **{pre-}**, before, in advance, combines freely with nouns (mainly as premodifiers):

Pre-19th century pre-war

pre-school (Gardner.2001:63)

5- **{re-}**, again, back, combines freely with deverbal nouns:

re-use recycle re-analysis (ibid)

2.3.1.8. Prefixes of Number

Items that are originally Greek or Latin are widely used as the first constituent in a range of expressions dealing with numerical values. The following prefixes combine freely, especially in specialized terminology, with nouns (Quirk *et al*, 1985:1545):`

1- **{bi-}**, two:

'bicycle 'biplane (ibid)

2- **{poly-}**, **{multi-}**, many. These items are used chiefly in premodification:

multiform multi-purpose

multi-storey (ibid)

3- **{semi-}**, **{demi-}**, **{mid-}**, half:

semicircle semivowel demijohn

mid-morning mid-November demitasse

(Bauer, 1983:219)

4- **{tri-}**, three:

tricycle tripod

triangle tricolour (Shammas,1999:180)

5- **{uni-}**, **{mono-}**, one:

unisex univalve uniform

monorail monoplane. (ibid)

2.3.1.9. Miscellaneous Neo-Classical Prefixes

It is possible to regard such items as combining forms, affecting compounds, compare **self** in **self-denial**, **deputy** in **deputy-director**, **under** in **under-secretary**, etc (Quirk et al, 1985:1545):

1- **{auto-}**, self, combines freely with nouns:

auto-biography automotion

autonomy (Gardner,2001:63)

2- **{neo-}**, new, revived, combines with nouns especially with

reference to movement:

neo-classicism

3- **{paleo-}**, old, chiefly in learned words like:

paleography

4- **{pan -}** , all, combines with nouns:

pan-African pan-Anglican

pan-American (ibid)

5- **{proto-}** , first , original , combines with nouns:

prototype

6- **{tele-}**, distance, combines chiefly with classical bases to form nouns:

telescope telegram

telephone (ibid)

7- **{vice-}**, deputy, combines freely with nouns:

vice president.

2.3.2. Nominal Suffixation

A suffix is a word's grammatical ending. Where the treatment of prefixes is on a generally semantic basis, the treatment of suffixes is on a generally grammatical basis. This is because, while prefixes primarily affect a semantic modification of the base, suffixes have by contrast only a small semantic role, their primary function being to change the grammatical function of the base (Quirk et al, 1985:1546).

Sledd (1959:62) compares two words **kindness**, and **unkindness**. "It is clear that **kindness** is common to both that **unkindness** contains {**un-**} which is not in **kindness** and that each word in isolation has its distinctive stress pattern, the form {**un-**}, we can agree, is a prefix, {**-ness**} is a suffix."

Suffixes are either derivational or inflectional, the former are, generally speaking, inner and non-final. The latter are usually outer and final. The inflectional suffixes close the structure of the word, while derivational suffixes do not. Noun suffixes are classified according to the form class of the derivatives they produce (Bauer, 1983:220), (Murphy, 2002:267) and (Karls, 1992:14).

2.3.2.1. Nominal Inflectional Suffixes

Nouns are supposed to show characteristics of number, case, and gender, but the last two of these have almost disappeared from English as grammatical categories. There is a system of native English words which retain their old Teutonic plurals as **ox- oxen**, **child- children**, **man- men**. A number of nouns adopts plurals with them as with **criterion-criteria**, **crisis- crises**, and there are some foreign forms which can have two plurals as with **medium- media**, **mediums** or **formula- formulae**,

formulas (Derbyshire, 1967:124), (Anderson, 1992:83) and (Antworth, 1995:4).

English nominal inflectional suffixes typically do not form stems. That is, once such a suffix is added, another suffix or a prefix is not ordinarily added to the word except possessive. Inflectional affixes are those affixes that close the structure of affixation after they are added. In English nouns are inflected for the plural and the possessive. The inflectional endings, namely the plural {-s} and the possessive {-s} morphemes used to express the grammatical ideas of the plural and the possessive, are thoroughly identical and behave similarly, i.e. have the same phonological distribution.

2.3.2.1.1. Plural Suffixes

The plural morpheme {-s} is conditioned either (1) phonologically, i.e. by the preceding sound:

book /buk/ — books [bʊks]

dog /dog/ — dogs [dɒgz]

ditch /dɪtʃ/ — ditches [dɪtʃɪz]

which yields what is called the regular plural or (2) morphologically, i.e. by historical factors associated with the noun base or stem to which it is suffixed no matter whether the noun to which it is suffixed is simple or compound:

man /mæn/ — men [men]

mouse /maʊs/ — mice [maɪs]

ox /ɒks/ — oxen [ɒksɪn]

which yields what is called the irregular plural.

Nouns which normally occur in the plural are plural count i.e. nouns denoting more than one, **two girls, these girls, these flowers, the chairs.** “A noun like dogs is marked for plural; dog is not marked for number.” (Wiese, 1997:136)

Plural in English manifests the following patterns:

1- {s , es} ~ /z/, /s/, and /iz/

Phonologically viewed, the regular plural inflection pronounced as [-s], [-z] or [-iz] depending on its phonetic environment, i.e. whether the preceding sound is voiceless or voiced.

The plural inflectional ending {-s} is pronounced [s] when suffixed to a singular noun ending with a voiceless consonant other than [s], [ʃ] and [t]:

cat /kat/ — cats [kats]

It is pronounced [z] when suffixed to a singular noun ending with a voiced consonant other than a strident:

bed /bed/ — beds [bedz]

and [iz] when suffixed to a singular noun ending with a strident other than [f] and [v]:

box /boks/ — boxes [boksiz]

(Shepherd et al, 1991:337)

2- /-s/ ~ /-z/, /θ/ ~ /ð/, /-f/ ~ /-v/

In a few plural nouns the last voiceless consonants become voiced:

house /haus/ — houses [hauziz]

bath /ba:θ/ — baths [ba:ðz]

(Gleason, 1961:18), (Quirk et al, 1985:1566)

self /self/ — selves [selvz]

wife /waif/ — wives [waivz] (Shepherd et al, 1991:337)

3-Vowel Replacive

A replacive must be described in terms of two sets of phonemes; those that appear when it is present in **geese** and those that appear when the replacive is absent in **goose** (Gleason, 1961:75).

tooth /tu:θ/ — teeth [ti:θ]

man /man/ — men [men]

mouse /maus/ — mice [mais]

(Krohn, 1974:68), (Swan, 1996:525), (Azar, 1999:99)

4- Zero Marking

The plural suffix {-s} also has a zero allomorph:

child — children

ox — oxen (Azar, 1999:99)

5- {-im}:

cherub — cherubim

seraph — seraphim

(Eckersley and Eckersley 1960:29)

6- {-is} ~ {-es}:

analysis — analyses

oasis — oases (ibid)

7- {-ex} , {-ix} ~ {-ices}:

spex — spices

appendix — appendices

codex — codices

8- {-us} ~ {-i}:

alumnus — alumni

terminus — termini (ibid)

9- {-a} ~ {-ae}:

alumna — alumnae

formula — formulae (Gleason,1961:99)

10- {-on} ~ {-a}:

criterion — criteria

phenomenon — phenomena (ibid)

11- {-um } ~ {-a}:

bacterium — bacteria

datum — data (ibid)

2.3.2.1.2. Possessive Suffixes

A-The Genitive (Possessive) Forms of Pronouns

The following table shows the possessive forms of pronouns :

Table (1)

Possessive Forms of Pronouns

Nominative	Genitive	Possessive
I	my	mine
you	your	yours
he	his	his
she	her	hers
it	its	its
we	our	ours
they	their	theirs

B- The Genitive (Possessive) Forms of Nouns

The possessive form of a NP referring to a thing is made by putting **of** before the NP. The genitive {-s} is used to show either real possession or to indicate something signified by another noun refers to the person (Krohn, 1974:151).

Possessive {-s} has four allomorphs /-s, -z, -iz, Φ /. The first three are phonologically conditioned and follow the same distribution as the similar allomorphs of plural {-s}:

1- /-s/

It occurs after nouns ending with voiceless consonants:

cat — cat's paw

Smith — Smith's book

Parent's duty — [duty of one parent]

Parents' duty — [duty of two or more parents]

(Graham, 1982:157)

2- **/-z/**

It occurs after nouns ending with voiced consonants or vowel:

Tom — Tom's hat

the boy — the boy's pen (Krohn, 1974:152)

3- **/-iz/**

It occurs after nouns ending with /s/, /z/, /ʃ/, /l/, /d/, and /t ʃ/:

Rose — Rose's car

James — James's hat (Gleason, 1961:100)

4- / **Φ** /

Zero morpheme occurs after plurals ending with /s/, or **/-z/** or **/-iz/** :

the boys — the boys' books

the cats — the cats' paws

the horses — the horses' paws (Karls, 1992:14)

2.3.2.2. Nominal Derivational Suffixes

These suffixes frequently alter the word-class of the root. For example by adding the suffix **{-ness}** to the adjective **kind**, it is changed to the noun **kindness**. Spencer (1991:6) shows: “a process by which a noun is derived from verbs, adjectives, and nouns is called derivation of nouns”.

2.3.2.2.1. Denominal Nouns: Abstract

Noun bases become largely non-count abstract or aggregate nouns of status or activity by means of the following suffixes:

1- **{-age}**, measure of, collection of:

baggage frontage mileage usage

knowledge voltage cabbage (Graham, 1982:190)

2- **{-dom}**, domain, condition. This suffix forms abstract, un-countable nouns from concrete, countable ones:

kingdom girlhood fogdom

dollardom gangsterdom (Bauer, 1983:220)

3- **{-ery}**, being:

drudgery slavery

delivery (Leech, 2001:10)

4- **{-ful}**, the amount contained in: spoonful, glassful, mouthful. It is

worth mentioning that this suffix can be considered as adjectival suffix:

peaceful beautiful

successful (Al-Hamash and Jamal, 1979:100)

5- **{-hood}**, status, being:

boyhood brotherhood

widowhood (Antworth,1995:5)

6- **{-ing}**, non count concrete aggregates are fairly freely formed:

tubing paneling

carpeting (ibid)

7- **{-ism}**, doctrine of, practice of:

impressionism racism absenteeism

idealism progressivism (ibid)

The items concerning **religion, politics, philosophy**, and **art** usually have a corresponding item in **{-ist}** to denote adherents or practitioners.

8- **{-ocracy}**, system of, government by:

democracy aristocracy meritocracy

They can be count and have corresponding personal nouns, democrat, etc.

9- **{-ship}**, usually denotes, being:

friendship membership relationship

Most items with this limitedly productive suffix can also be count and some have an adjective base as in: **hardship**. (ibid)

2.3.2.2.2. *Denominal Nouns: Concrete*

The following noun suffixes combine with noun bases to yield concrete and individualizing items over a rather wide semantic range. Only {er} is freely productive (Quirk *et al*, 1985:1566).

1- {-eer}, skilled in, engaged in:

pamphleteer profiteer

racketeer (ibid)

2- {-er}, having as dominant characteristic, denizen of:

teenager north-wester (of wind) Wheeler

villager Londoner (ibid).

In tone, this resembles the familiarity markers:

cooker roaster boiler [cooking apply, boiling fowl, etc] the base seems to be a verb.

3- {-ess}, gender:

waitress lioness manageress stewardess (ibid)

This prefix adds feminine marking to animate nouns, sometimes the vowel of the preceding unstressed agential suffix is elided **wait**, **waiter**, **waitress**, **astronautess** (Quirk *et al*, 1985:1548), (Bauer, 1983:221).

4- {-ette}, compact, fairly productive:

kitchenette dinerette dinette towelette.

imitation as in : flannelette leatherette (Stageberg, 1971:102)

5- {-let}, small, unimportant:

booklet leaflet piglet starlet

streamlet ringlet anklet (ibid)

6- {-ling}, minor, off spring of:

princeling duckling hireling

underling darling (ibid)

7- {-ster}, involved in:

trickster gangster gamester (ibid)

2.3.2.2.3. *Deverbal Nouns*

In English it is possible to derive nouns from verbs by adding the suffixes, {-al}, {-(a)tion} to the verbal stem. However some of these derivations do not exist although there are no grammatical reasons for their non-existence, as in:

arrive arrival *arriviation

derive *derival derivation

Sculise (1992:21) and Halle (1993:101) believe that deverbal nouns do not include the ‘gerund’ class of nouns ending in {-ing} (**waiting, etc.**). Because of the complete productivity of the verbal noun category, the relation between verbal nouns and the corresponding verbs is considered to be purely grammatical rather than derivational. Another class of words having arguably the same status of full productivity is that of **gential nouns** as in **worker**.

The following suffixes combine with verb base to produce noun:

1- {-ant}, a chiefly formal a gential:

habitant contestant informant

2- {-ee}, one who is object of the verb:

appointee payee examinee

testee curee blackmailee (Bauer, 1983:223)

3- {-er}, {-or}, forms a gential noun:

singer driver teacher (Sapir, 2005:6)

Gentials may be non-personal:

Silencer computer thriller (ibid)

With neo-classical bases, the suffix is often spelled {-or}:

accelerator actor supervisor

“{-er} is correctly recognized as an agentive suffix that attaches to a verb, such as writer.” (Antworth, 1995:3)

The meanings of affixes skip clearly from one derivational function to another: subjective, objective, instrumental, even the highly idiomatic functions of {-er} generally come from this limited set of derivational functions: **Locative: diner. Action nominal : merger. Objective: loaner.** The referential range of the set of English affixes is determined by the range of meaning in the closed set of grammatical categories.

4- {-age}, action of, instance of forms abstract and usually non count:

breakage, coverage, drainage, leverage, storage, package, marriage.

5-{-al}, result of, the action, chiefly count:

refusal dismissal arrival denial (Shammas,1998:181)

It can also yield adjectives: accidental experimental clinical (ibid).

6- {-ation}, the process or state of, normally used as non count: exploration, starvation, ratification, victimization.

The product of, the institution produced by, aggregate count noun: foundation, organization. (Ackert, 1999:225)

categorization, institutionalization, lexicalization (Bauer,1983:221)

This suffix freely combines with verbs ending in **{-ize}**, **{-ify}**, **{-ate}**, with pronunciation and stress suggest that analogous endings already present in adopted nouns (often paired with adopted verbs): **decide --- decision**. Many words in **{-ation}** in fact show borrowing from Roman rather than English word – formation (Bauer, 1983:221).

This suffix also comes from Latin in words like: **invitationis and conditionis** (Roberts, 1967:192). Various other form changes take place when **{-ion}** is added to other verbs:

explosion succession (ibid)

Many morphologically derived forms cannot be decomposed due to phonological or morphological irregularity: for example, the word **reception** is clearly derived from the verb root **receive** plus the nominalizing suffix **{-tion}**, other words exemplifying this pattern include **deceive/ deception, conceive/ conception, perceive/ perception** and so on (Antworth, 1992:8).

7- {-ing}, concrete count nouns referring to what result from the

action of the base: building, opening, filling. Some are obligatory

plural: earnings savings

shavings (ibid)

Occasionally the formations are noncount: **stuffing, clothing**. The abstract count items: **christening, wedding**, refer rather to the occasion of the activity verb base gerunds are verbal nouns which inherit the sub categorization properties of the corresponding verbs. Moreover, gerunds appear in syntactic positions typical for nouns, although their behaviour is strictly speaking verbal in nature . These nominalizations can be modified by deverbals, while nouns can only be modified by adjectives:

Tom's **criticizing** the book (ibid)

8- {-ment}, the result of:

arrangement amazement puzzlement

embodiment management judgment (Graham, 1982:190)

A great many nominalized verbs in English have both a transparent meaning and an extended meaning; for instance, **government** can mean **the act of governing** or it can refer to a particular political institution. (ibid: 6)

9- {-ure}, being. This suffix forms abstract nominalizations from verbs:

failure departure pressure (Bauer, 1983:223)

2.3.2.2.4 De – Adjectival Nouns

There are two very common suffixes by means of which abstract (and normally noncount) nouns are formed from adjective bases:

1- **{-ity}**, especially associated with adjectives of neo-classical or French origin, with stress shift wherever necessary, to place the stress on the last syllable before the suffix:

elasticity rapidity

This suffix is freely productive, especially with adjectives in **{able}**, **{al}**, **{ar}**: respectability actuality regularity

2- **{-ness}**, being, the need for a **-ness** formation is clear where the lexicalized item has developed a meaning relatively remote from the ordinary meaning of the adjective bases:

sensible sensibility sensibleness bigness iciness

There are other suffixes which form nouns particularly from adjectives:

{-ant}, **{-ent}**: excellency. (Fries, 1952:97)

There are other suffixes form nouns from adjectives:**{-ce}**

dependent > dependence

elegant > elegance

excellent > excellence (Bauer, 1983:223)

2.3.2.2.5. Noun/ Adjective Suffixes

A number of suffixes yield items that can be used both as nouns and as normally adjectives, the formations basically relate to human being chiefly as members of a group, and may be both denominal and de-adjectival or nationality name (Quirk et al, 1985:1552):

1- {-ese}, member of, the language of, the style of:

Chinese Japanese Portuguese
Journalese (ibid)

2- {-(i)an}, adherent to, relating to:

Darwinian Republican Shakespearian
Elizabethan Chomskyite (ibid)

3- {-ist}, skilled in, practicing: violinist (ibid)

4- {-ite}, adherent to, member of:

Benthamite Shamanite
Chomskyite. (ibid)

2.3.3. Nominal Conversion

Nominal conversion is the derivational process whereby an item is adapted or converted to a new word class without the addition of an affix, in this way, conversion is closely analogous to suffixation (as distinct from prefixation). For example, the verb (**release**) as in **they released him** corresponds to the noun **release** as in **they ordered his**

release, and this relationship may be seen as parallel to that between the verb **acquit** as in **they acquitted him** and the noun **acquittal** as in **they ordered his acquittal**. For example:

	V	→	N
suffixation:	acquit		acquittal
conversion:	release		release (Quirk et al,1985:1558)

Many words in English belong to more than one part of speech. For instance, the word **ride** can be either verb or noun since the verb **ride** and the noun **ride** appear to have the same sense (Antworth, 1995:6).

The relation between them is often described as zero derivation or conversion. In contrast, the verb **shed** and the noun **shed** have unrelated sense and thus are not derivationally related.

Clearly homonyms such as the verb **shed** and the noun **shed** should receive separate lexical entries since they have no lexical relation to each other. A word belonging to the noun-verb sub lexicon is expanded into both a noun and a verb. The lexicon returns two results, one where **shed** is a verb and another where it is a noun. Examples of verb to noun conversion include, **love, laugh, answer, cover, and walk**, while examples of noun to verb conversion include: **bottle, grease, and father**. However, it is often difficult or arbitrary to determine the direction of nominal conversion of related words (Smith, 1969:22).

Conversion is an extremely productive way of producing new words in English. There do not appear to be morphological restrictions on the forms that can undergo conversion. In words of Antworth (1995:62)

“Conversion is a word used as one part of speech which may also fulfill a different function in a different context.” Conversion is a derivational process that involves no overt affixation. Lexical and grammatical meaning is directly conveyed by sound, so, absence of sound should imply the absence of lexical or grammatical meaning. European morphologists account for zero morphology as a process wholly distinct from derivation, nominal conversion implies the affixed and unaffixed form (Sculise, 1992:45) and (Katamba, 1993:93).

As a syntactic process, conversion is the use of a form which is regarded as being basically of one form class as though it were a member of a different form class, without any concomitant change of form.

Nominal conversion is defined by Crystal (1991:92) as “a term used in the study of word formation to refer to the derivational process whereby an item comes to belong to a new word-class without the addition of an affix: verb /noun **smell / taste/ hit.**”

2.3.3.1. Deverbal Nouns

Deverbal nouns are far more dynamic than those are acceptable in normal usage. These dynamic nouns reflect the verbal aspects of things in particular, **people** and **things** (Cureton, 2005:16).

1- State , state of mind or state of sensation (from verbs used statively to count or noncount nouns):

desire dismay doubt love smell taste want

(Quirk et al, 1985:1567)

2-Event/ Activity, (from verbs used dynamically):

attempt fall hit laugh release search swim shut-down walk-out
blow-out (of a tyre) (ibid)

3- Object of Verb:

answer [that which answers]
bet catch find hand-out

4-Subject of Verb:

bore [someone who or that which bores / is boring]
cheat coach show-off stand in (ibid)

5-Instrument of Verb:

cover [something with which to cover things]
paper wrap wrench

6-Manner of verb-ing:

walk [manner of walking] throw lie (Quirk *et al*,1985:1567)

7- Place of Verb:

divide, retreat, rise, turn, lay-by, drive-in (ibid)

2.3.3.2. De-Adjectival Nouns

There is no very productive pattern of adjective-noun conversion. There are many miscellaneous examples:

I'd like two pints of bitter, please. [=type of beer]

As a football player, he has a naturally. [=a naturally skilled player] Also daily [daily newspaper], weakly, monthly, annual. (Quirk et al, 1985:1567)

From these examples, it is seen that adjective-noun conversion can usually be explained in terms of a well-established adjective + NP from which the noun has been ellipped.

2.3.3.3. Minor Categories of Conversion to Nouns

1-From closed-class words:

His argument contains too many ifs and buts.

This book is a must for the student of aerodynamics. (ibid)

a spy, a guess, a goggle, and an interrupt (Bauer, 1983:229)

2-From affixes: very occasionally, an affix may be converted into a noun:

Patriotism, nationalism, and any other isms you'd like to name.

3- From phrases: sequences of more than one word are sometimes used as nouns, reduced to one-word states by conversion rather than by any of the normal patterns of compounding:

Whenever I gamble, my horse is one of the also-rans [i.e. one of the horses which did not win but merely also rans], the high-ups, he is a has-been, a been-to, a free-for-all, some down-and-outs.

(Quirk et al, 1985:1563)

2.3.3.4 Change of Secondary Word Class: Nouns

The notion of nominal conversion may be extended to changes of secondary word class, within the same major word category. Such transfers are only partially productive, and yet can be explained systematically in terms of derivation, they are therefore parallel to the major conversion processes already discussed, though to the extent that they can be predicted as the regular products of grammatical processes, they might be considered as strictly lying outside the province of word-formation. Types of nominal conversion within the noun category are:

A- Noncount noun → Count noun

i- A unit of noun:

two coffees [cups of coffee], two (huge) cheeses. (Quirk *et al*, 1985:1564)

ii- A kind of noun:

Some paints are more lasting than others.

This is a better bread than the one I bought last. (ibid)

iii- An instance of noun (with abstract nouns):

a difficulty, small kindness, a miserable failure, home truths, a great injustice.(ibid)

B- Count noun → Noncount noun

Noun viewed in terms of a measurable extent (normally only when accompanied by expressions of a amount):

an inch of pencil; a few square feet of floor.

C- Proper noun → Common noun

i- A member of the class typified by noun:

a Jeremiah [a gloomy prophet who denounces his age]

a latter-day Plutarch [----chronicler of great men] (ibid)

Edinburgh is the Athens of the north. (Quirk et al,1985:1564)

ii- A product of noun:

a Rolls Royce [a car manufactured by Rolls Royce]

The museum has several Renoirs.

D-Stative noun → Dynamic noun

Nouns are characteristically stative, but they can assume the dynamic meaning of ‘temporary role or activity’ as subject complement following the progressive of be:

He is being a fool [he is behaving like a fool]

2.3.3.5. Conversion with Formal Modifications

In some cases, nominal conversion is accompanied by certain non affixal changes affecting pronunciation or spelling or stress distribution. The most important kinds of alteration are **voicing of final consonants**, and **shift of stress**. Both kinds are idiosyncratic in respect of the particular instances that occur, though they follow certain clear patterns.

A- Voicing of Final Consonants

The voiced fricative consonants /z/, /v/, and /ð / in some verbs are unvoiced to /s/, /f/, and /θ / respectively in the corresponding noun forms:

V	→	N	
house /-z/		house /-s/	
advise /-z/		advice /-s/	
use /-z/		use /-s/	(Bauer,1983:229)
grieve /-v/		grief /-f/	
shelve /-v/		shelf /-f/	
mouth /-ð /		mouth /-θ /	(Quirk <i>et al</i> , 1985:1566)

B- Shift of Stress

When verbs of two syllables are converted into nouns, the stress is sometimes shifted from the second to the first syllable. The first syllable, typically a Latin prefix, often has a reduced vowel in the verb but a full vowel in the noun:

V → N

abstráct áabstract (ibid)

acc□ent áaccent

com□bine ácombine (Katamba, 1993:54)

Words such as **ifs**, **buts**, and **may bes** occur in a scrap of dialogue :

There will be no ifs and may bes about it ! just do it ! (Cureton, 2005:17)

Similarly, **a must** is something about which one would say **I must do that.** or **I must have that.** (ibid)

Of course, as in many linguistic phenomena, there is no well- defined line between conversions of this sort and more normal conversions, such as: **a doubt**, or **a desire**. Rather, there is a continuum between conversions of type **a desire** and token-conversions **a may be**.

Token- Conversions

Type- Conversion

a now

a desire

a then

a doubt

a why

a need (ibid)

On the right are those conversions where the referent of the nominal is **unified** by the speaker. On the left, however, the nominals appear to represent only a certain type of statement about a situation since token conversions refer primarily to speech acts **tokens** and only secondarily to entities **concepts**.

In normal usage, token conversions with quantifiers are much less frequent than the set of function words while quantifiers function as nouns in the singular:

All were here. None were left.

More come and so forth

The plural forms: **alls**, **mosts**, **boths**, etc, are virtually prohibited except in pure token references. Where such a form might occur. English speakers tend to use the quantifier as a mass noun, and , even here, **all** is the only quantifier which appears:

he gave his all (ibid)

Chapter Three
Data Collection

Chapter Three

Data Collection

3.1. Introduction

This chapter is devoted to present a description of the test which must be seen as a method of providing information that may be used for teaching purposes. Moreover, it collects data about the subjects to whom the test is applied as well as material's selection. Validity and reliability of the test are defined as well. Moreover, the present chapter describes the pilot and the main administration of the test along with the scoring scheme adopted.

3.2. Objectives of the Test

If the objectives of a language course are worthwhile and have been properly constructed to reflect the needs of the students, then the test that is based on those objectives should reflect the important language points that are being taught. The test results should provide useful feedback to both teachers and students on the effectiveness of the teaching and learning processes.

The data collection aims at:

- 1- diagnosing the difficulties which are relative to the use of English NAs.
- 2- finding out, through accounting for the errors detected and through a statistical study of their frequency, which of them are due to the complexity of the nominal inflection and derivation in English, and which

- of them can be attributed to the factors of linguistic transfer or interference from the source language ,Arabic, into the target language.
- 3- finding out through a frequency count of the errors detected and the frequency rate of the difficulties or problems encountered by Iraqi learners.
 - 4- identifying the level at which the students would do better: recognition or production.
 - 5- knowing if the students can do better with words in isolation, out of context, or in context.

3.3. The Need for the Language Test

Testing always has a **wash back** influence .The kind of testing that is employed and the aspects of language that are tested necessarily find their way into the teaching programmes. The term **wash back** refers to the effects of a test on teaching. If a test has good wash back effects, it will exert a good influence on learning and teaching that takes place after the test (Ellis, 1984:313).

This test is a device used to assess the learners' performance at a certain learning stage of a certain syllabus the former kind of test yields an assessment called **formative assessment or evaluation**.The test constructed here (see Appendix 1) aims at evaluating the Iraqi university students' performance at a certain learning stage of a certain syllabus.

This test is also an **achievement** test (or attainment) the concern is with measuring what has been learnt of what has been taught, or what is in the syllabus, textbook, materials, etc

Heaton (1988:1) and Davies (1990:6) point out that a **true diagnostic** test seeks to plot learning to date (in certain specified areas) and sets out, through the student profile arrived at, to characterize what is needed in

order to remedy errors. Moreover, diagnostic tests enable the teacher to identify specific areas of weakness and difficulty so that he is able to plan the most appropriate remedial programme.

3.4. Description of the Test

3.4.1. The Rationale of the Test

This test is of **Criterion-Referenced Tests** (henceforth **CRTs**), a criterion-referenced test is usually produced to measure well-defined and fairly specific objectives. Often these objectives are specific to a particular course, programme school. The purpose of **CRTs** is to measure the amount of learning that a student has accomplished on each objective. In most cases the students would know in advance what types of questions, tasks, and content to expect for each objective because the question content would be implied in the objective of the course (Brown, 1996:2).

This test consists of five questions. The first two questions are designed to measure the subjects' responses on the recognition level. The **first question** is about matching technique in separate words . This technique provides the students with two columns of information; the students must match between the two sets of information. The information given on the left hand column will be called **premises** and that shown on the right-hand column will be labeled **options**. Thus in a matching test, students must match the correct option to each premise.

More options should be supplied than premises so that students cannot narrow down the choices as they go along by simply keeping track of the options that they have already used. As in the present test, there are ten words which are from different classes that should be matched to a list of

NAs which should be more than ten because a student who knows nine will be assured of getting the tenth one correct by the process of elimination, therefore, this problem is minimized in **questions (1 and 2)**. The premises and options should be logically related to one central theme that is obvious to the students (Brown, 1996:6).

In the **second question**, there are ten sentences with blanks and twelve nominal prefixes, the subjects are asked to fill in the blanks with the most meaningful nominal prefixes. The subjects' responses to this question will reflect the extent to which they can master the context and thus choose the appropriate prefixes.

The last three questions are designed to measure the subjects' responses on the production level. Productive response items require the students actually to produce responses rather than just select them as in **questions (1 and 2)**. Productive item formats include fill in items. The **third question** has ten items. It measures the ability of the subjects to use the inflectional affixes in pluralization. The **fourth question** contains ten words, which are supplied in isolation, out of context, the subjects were asked to derive nouns from these verbs, adjectives, and nouns. The **fifth question** contains ten items, the subjects are asked to change the words in the blanks into nouns in order to complete sentences and they must not use the form more than once.

The use of the five techniques in testing the **NAs** is based on the ideas and principles drawn from relevant testing sources. In this sense, Huebener (1968:14) states: "In order to teach with good review of the students' performance; the test should consist of a fair sampling of items and appropriate choice of different types of questions."

Finocchiaro (1970:10) and Lee (1985:31) stress that learning any language passes through stages, i.e. recognition, imitation, and production. It is unlikely that anyone would wish to dispute the fact that testing is an integral part of the teaching and learning processes. Therefore, the two levels, i.e. recognition and production should be tested.

It is clear that the idea of using isolated items in testing any element of language has not been recommended by some experts in language testing when assessing the ability of recognition and that of production. Moreover, some other experts not only prefer the idea of testing through a text but also reject testing through isolated items as a whole. Mrea (1982:45) emphasizes: “The isolated format is inadequate as there are a large number of items which cannot be adequately assessed without reference to the context in which they are normally found in actual communication, an appropriate linguistic form is selected for its function within a text, which also involves decisions about the overall function of the text itself”. In this test, Q4 represents the isolated items whereas Q5 refers to context.

3.4.2. The Content of the Test

Most of the items of the test have been selected from the grammar books mentioned in Chapter Two as well as from that of the textbook by **N.Stageberg, (1971)**. The items cover, as far as possible, the types of NAs and their various functions.

Furthermore, the selection of the test items has been approved by a jury¹ committee of thirteen experienced university lecturers.

1- The jury consists of the following members:

Prof. Abdul Latif Al-Jumaily (Ph.D.in Applied Linguistics), College of Arts/
University of Baghdad.

Prof. Sabah Al-Rawi (Ph.D.in Linguistics and Translation), College of Languages/
University of Baghdad.

Prof. Salih M.Hameed (Ph.D.in Literature), College of Education/ University of
Babylon.

Asst. Prof. Abbas D.Derweesh (Ph.D. in Linguistics and Translation), College of
Education / University of Babylon.

Asst. Prof. Abdul Karim Fadhil (Ph.D.in Linguistics), College of Education Ibn
Rushid / University of Baghdad.

Asst. Prof. Adil Al-Akkam (M.A. in English Language and Linguistics), College of
Basic Education/ University of Babylon.

Asst. Prof. Hameed Hassoon (Ph.D.in Linguistics and Translation), College of
Education/ University of Babylon.

Asst. Prof. Muayyad M.Saad (Ph.D.in Methods of Teaching English as a Foreign
Language), College of Education Ibn Rushid/ University of Baghdad.

Asst. Prof. Munthir Manhal (Ph.D.in Linguistics and Translation), College of
Languages/ University of Baghdad.

Asst. Prof. Razzaq N.Mukheef (M.A.in English Language and Linguistics), College
of Education/ University of Babylon.

Asst. Prof. Shatha Al-Saadi (M.A.in Methods of Teaching English as a Foreign
Language), College of Education for Women/ University of Baghdad.

Lecturer. Maysaa K. Hussein (Ph.D. in English Language and Linguistics), College of
Education/ University of Al-Qadisiya.

Lecturer. Wafaa M. Faisal (Ph.D.in Methods of Teaching English as a Foreign
Language), College of Education/ University of Babylon.

3.5. Validity

Since the researcher's main concern in this study is to measure the pupils' ability in **NAs** both at the recognition and production levels, the techniques and items used are carefully constructed so as not to give space to other affixes to be tested other than **NAs**. Hence, validity is ensured as Heaton (1988: X) indicates: "A good test should possess validity: that is, it should measure what is intended to measure and nothing else. If a test does this it is said to be valid. If a test item looks right to other testers, teachers and testees, it can be desired as having at least face validity."

In order to ensure content validity, much attention is given to the content of the textbooks of the second and third stages as far as **NAs** are concerned. In order to investigate content validity, testers must decide whether the test is a representative sample of the content of whatever the test was designed to measure (Brown, 1996:233).

Therefore, a survey has been made by the researcher of the textbooks not only of the second and third academic stages but also of the secondary stages. This ensures that the students have been exposed to the **NAs** during the previous stages. These **NAs** are introduced in Books 3,4,5,6,7 and 8 of the New English Course for Iraq of their secondary stage as well as the textbooks adopted in the second and third college stages respectively **An Introductory English Grammar** by **Stageberg (1971)** and **A University Grammar of English** by **Quirk and Greenbaum (1973)**.

Besides, statistical treatment of the students' scores in the pilot study was made to ensure sensible methods of test construction.

3.6. Reliability

Reliability is a necessary characteristic of any good test. Reliability is strongly connected with objectivity. What reliability internal consistency demonstrates is that there is consistency about the test as a whole, that scores from any section of the test are equivalent to scores on any other section (Davies, 1990:34).

A test, like any other type of instrument used to measure, should give the same results every time it measures, (if it is used under the same conditions), should measure exactly what it is supposed to measure (not something else), and should be practical to use.

Heaton (1988:150) agrees with Palmer (1974:32) that “the reliability of the versions is directly proportional to the similarity of the results obtained when administered to the same test population.” There are methods of estimating the reliability of a test such as test re-test, re-administer split-half, equivalent forms and Kurder-Richardson Method (Brown, 1996:185).

The method adopted to estimate the reliability of the present test is Kurder-Richardson of which the following formula can be considered:

$$r = \frac{N}{N-1} \left(1 - \frac{m^2}{\sum X^2} \right)$$

Where:

r = reliability.

N = the number of items in the scores.

m = the mean of the test scores.

X = the standard deviation of the test scores.

The computation of this formula has yielded that the reliability coefficient of the present test is **0.93**, which is a highly positive correlation.

3.7. The Subjects

In choosing the subjects of this study, care was taken to ensure that the students had the same linguistic background and that no erroneous factors were allowed to affect the results of the test. Weir (1993:38) asserts that the roles attached to students should certainly be within their experience and appropriate to their age and culture.

The sample of this study consists of one hundred and fifty subjects of the third academic year (**2004-2005**) of the Department of English at the College of Education. This sample was selected equally from Universities of **Babylon, Baghdad** and **Al-Qadisiya** in order to make a representative sample of the target population and ensure the reality of the difficulties that **EFL** college students encounter in using **NAs**. The sample represents about **70%** of the total student population. They are all Iraqis who have similar **EFL** background and their average age is twenty-one years old. The repeaters were excluded.

The third year students are preferred to apply the test because the topic under investigation has been taught in their second year of study at the university. They are also taught parts of speech; one of them includes nouns, in their third year. The textbooks adopted in their second and third years are respectively (**An Introductory English Grammar**) by

Stageberg (1971) and (*A University Grammar of English*) by Quirk and Greenbaum (1973).

3.8. Pilot Administration

In order to estimate the time needed and to have an idea about the test thirty students were chosen randomly from the third year students who are excluded from the final administration. The instructions are explained by the researcher and the students were motivated. In this sense, Al-Hamash and Younis (1980,12) say: “tests are more reliable if the students are motivated to do their best.”

The results of the pilot test have indicated that the time required to answer the whole items of the test is about one hour. Weir (1993:24) states: “a reasonable amount of time must be provided for the majority of the test takers to be able to complete the task. If too little time is made available, stress will result and we will not elicit the students’ best performance.”

All the results obtained from the pilot administration of this test have been incorporated into the final version of the test.

3.8.1. Item Analysis

Item analysis is the systematic evaluation of the effectiveness of the individual items on a test. This is usually done for the purpose of selecting the “best” items that will remain on a revised and improved version of the test (Brown, 1996:50).

Information concerning the performance of the students as a whole and of individual students is very important for teaching purposes, especially as many test results can show not only the types of errors most frequently made but also the reasons for the errors being made. All items should be examined from the point of view of (1) their difficulty level or facility value (henceforth FV) and (2) their level of discrimination (henceforth DL) (Heaton, 1988:178) and (Davies, 1990:192).

1- Facility Value

FV of an item simply shows how easy or difficult the particular item proved in the test. “The index of difficulty **FV** is generally expressed as the fraction (or percentage) of the students who answered the item correctly.” It is calculated by using the formula:

$$\mathbf{FV} = \mathbf{R / N}$$

R: represents the number of correct answers and **N** the number of students taking the test.

The application of this formula has yielded that the item difficulty ranges between **0.23__ 0.80**. In this respect, Brown (1996:95) point out that “a good spread of results can be obtained if the items vary in difficulty from **0.20 to 0.80**.” Therefore, the item difficulty of the present test is satisfactory. (See **Table 2**)

Table (2)

The Facility Value and the Discrimination Index of the Test Items

No. of Q	No. of items	FV	D	No. of Q	No. of items	FV	D
1	1	36	60		6	50	33
	2	76	65		7	30	33
	3	53	67		8	53	30
	4	60	70		9	50	33
	5	66	78		10	33	66
	6	66	70	4	1	57	47
	7	26	34		2	23	30
	8	66	70		3	43	40
	9	80	70		4	33	40
	10	70	60		5	23	30
2	1	57	33		6	33	30
	2	57	33		7	30	47
	3	37	33		8	43	47
	4	73	53		9	30	47
	5	37	47		10	37	60
	6	50	60	5	1	33	30
	7	33	53		2	43	30
	8	50	47		3	40	40
	9	33	53		4	73	80
	10	33	53		5	43	47
3	1	80	40		6	40	67
	2	53	40		7	43	47
	3	37	43		8	27	40
	4	47	43		9	43	43
	5	30	30		10	27	40

2- Item Discrimination

Level of discrimination of an item indicates the extent to which the item discriminates between the testees, separating the more able testees from the less able. The index of discrimination tells us whether those

students who performed well on the whole test tended to do well or badly on each item in the test.

It is pre-supposed that the total score on the test is a valid measure of the student's ability, (i.e. the good student tends to do well on the test as a whole and the poor student tends to do badly.) On this basis, the score on the whole test is accepted as the criterion measure, and it thus becomes possible to separate the good students from the bad ones on performances on individual items.

There are various methods of obtaining the index of discrimination: all involve a comparison of those students who performed well on the whole test and those who performed poorly on the whole test. Item discrimination is calculated by using the formula:

$$D = [\text{Correct U} - \text{Correct L}] / N$$

D=Discrimination Index; N = Number of candidates in one group; U= Upper half and L = Lower half.

The index D is thus the difference between the proportion passing the item in U and L (Heaton.1988:174). After the computation of this formula, it has been found that the discrimination power ranges between **0.30 – 0.80**. See (**Table2**). According to Ebel (1972:399), “Good classroom test items have indices of discrimination of 0.30 or more.”

3.9. Final Administration

The main test was carried out on the **12th, March** during the academic year **2004-2005**. The time allocated for the test was one hour. The subjects were assured that the test was purely for research purposes and had no bearing on marks.

After distributing the test papers, the instructions were clearly explained. The subjects were instructed to answer on the same test sheet to save time and effort. Al-Hamash and Younis (1980:205) remark: “a good test should be economic both in time stationary”.

The subjects, then, were encouraged to respond to the test and they can ask about any information that they need to explain any ambiguity. In order to avoid embarrassment the subjects were asked not to write their names on the test sheets. The process of marking the test has been done by the researcher using the scoring scheme presented in **(3.10)**.

The final test was given to the students under the same conditions. What they were required to do in each technique was given to them in English and in students' native language, i.e. Arabic, in order to clarify the ambiguities that they might meet when answering the questions. In the words of Carroll (1980:16), “a good test is expected to provide as much information as is required with the minimum expenditure of time, efforts and resources.”

3.10. Scoring Scheme

Reliability also depends upon scores. If those who score the test have a clear idea of what marks to give for what kind of response the reliability of the test improves. A reliable test demands a definite scoring scheme which is fully understood and respected by those who score the test (Al-Hamash and Younis, 1980:46). This test consists of five questions and each question has ten items. The entire test has been scored out of **100**. The scores have been distributed in such a way as to give two scores for each correct answer and zero score for the incorrect one. The items that were left by the subjects with no answer have also been given

zero since these items predicate that the subjects have failed to give the appropriate answer.

Moreover, the necessary changes that were not made by the subjects have been given zero since these changes predicate that the subjects failed to give the correct answer.

On a criterion-referenced final examination, all students who have learned all the course materials should be able to score **100** on the final examination. Such **CRTs** scores can provide useful information for evaluating the effectiveness of the objectives, the test itself, the materials, the teaching and so forth. **CRTs** can prove enlightening in the never-ending evaluation process (Brown, 1996:5).

The scoring scheme adopted for the present test can be illustrated in **Table (3)**.

Table (3)
Distribution of the Scores of the Test

NO.OF Q	NO.OF ITEMS	SCORES	PERCENTAGE
1	10	20	20
2	10	20	20
3	10	20	20
4	10	20	20
5	10	20	20
Total	50	100	100

Chapter Four
Data Analysis
and Results

Chapter Four

Data Analysis and Results

4.1. Introduction

The aim of this chapter is to determine and specify the plausible sources of the errors made by Iraqi EFL college students in using NAs in order to get some insights into the nature of the difficulties that college students encounter in this area. Additionally, this chapter surveys the responses of the subjects to each question as well as identifying and showing their errors statistically.

4.2. Discussion of the Results

This section shows the results of the subjects' performance on each question of the test in particular and on the whole test in general. The types of errors and their actual reasons have been shown.

4.2.1. Subjects' Performance of the First Question

The results obtained from analyzing the subjects' performance of each item in this question are presented in **Table (4)**.

Table (4)

Subjects' Performance at the Recognition Level of Question (1)

No. of Item	No. of CRs	%	No. of IRs	%
1	77	51.3	73	48.7
2	115	76.7	35	23.3
3	77	51.3	73	48.7
4	107	71.3	43	28.7
5	112	74.7	38	25.3
6	101	67.3	49	32.7
7	64	42.7	86	57.3
8	120	80	30	20
9	123	82	27	18
10	112	74.7	38	25.3
Total	1008	67.2	492	32.8

The table displays the correct and incorrect responses of each item. The total number of correct responses is **(1008)** of the total number of the subjects' responses in this question which constitutes **(67.2%)** whereas that of incorrect ones is **(492)** which constitutes **(32.8%)**.

Incorrect responses which are identified according to their types are ordered from the commonest type **(342)**, which adds up to **(22.8%)** to the least one **(48)**, which adds up to **(3.2%)**:

1- Incorrect spelling

This type of error constitutes the largest one among the other types as shown in (Table 5). This type of error appears in (342) which adds up to (22.8%).

Table (5)
Errors Made in Responses to Question (1)

Type of the Error	No.	%
1- Incorrect spelling	342	22.8
2- Wrong choice of the required suffixes	102	6.8
3- Giving no response	48	3.2
Total	492	32.8

This type of error can be described as giving wrong formation of nouns since there are unacceptable changes in the spelling of the given items. Here is a list illustrating these errors as in items: 1,3, 4, 5, 7, and 8 respectively:

- * likelyhood likelihood
- *jaloosi jealousy
- *merige marriage
- *iaviation invitation
- *eaxsitment excitement
- *aerrivil arrival

2- Wrong choice of the required suffixes

This error forms **(102)** with a percentage of **(6.8)**. Here is a list including these errors as in items: 1,3, 4, 6, 9 and 10 respectively in Q1:

*likeliness	likelihood
*jealousness	jealousy
*marryment	marriage
*historyship	historian
*relationhood	relationship
*spoony	spoonful

3- Giving no response

This type of errors is totaled **(48)** non-responses out of **(1500)** responses, which constitutes **(3.2%)**. Here is a list of the items: 3, 6, 8 and 10, which the students failed to give:

- * _____ jealous
- * _____ history
- * _____ arrive
- * _____ spoon

4.2.2. Subjects' Performance of the Second Question

The second question also measures the subjects' ability to recognize the meaning of the prefixes that add or change the meaning of the words in order to complete sentences.

Table (6) presents the correct and incorrect responses of each item. The total number of the correct responses is **(420)** which constitutes

(28%), whereas that of the incorrect ones is (1080) which constitutes (72%).

Table (6)

Subjects' Performance at the Recognition Level of Question (2)

No. of Item	No. of CRs	%	No. of IRs	%
1	45	30	105	70
2	52	34.67	98	65.33
3	18	12	132	88
4	81	54	69	46
5	34	22.67	116	77.33
6	41	27.33	109	77.67
7	34	22.67	116	77.33
8	60	40	90	60
9	30	20	120	80
10	25	16.67	125	83.33
Total	420	28	1080	72

Incorrect responses are classified according to their types into two groups:

1- Wrong choice of the required prefixes

This type of error is made in (977), adding up to (65.13%).

See (Table 7)

Items: 1, 2, 5, 7,8 and 9:

*substop nonstop

*unicycles tricycles

*prewar post war

- *malway subway
- *over millionaire super millionaire

2- Giving no response

This type of error is made in **(103)** non-responses which constitutes **(6.87%)**. Here is a list of items: 1, 2, 4,7,8,9 and 10:

- * _____ stop
- * _____ husband
- * _____ work
- * _____ war
- * _____ way
- * _____ millionaire
- * _____ function

Table (7)
Errors Made in Responses to Question (2)

Type of Error	No.	%
1- Wrong choice of the required prefix	977	65.13
2- Giving no response	103	6.87
Total	1080	72

The subjects' total performance in the first and second questions, however, can be summed up in the following table.

Table (8)
Subjects' Total Performance at the Recognition Level of Questions
(1 and 2)

No. of Q	No. of CRs	%	No. of IRs	%
1	1008	67.2	492	32.8
2	420	28	1080	72
Total	1428	47.6	1572	52.4

The table (8) reveals the subjects' inefficiency at the recognition level. Since the highest rate of their responses is incorrect (1572) with a percentage of (52.4%) the first hypothesis, which states that most Iraqi EFL college students do not often distinguish NAs, is validated.

4.2.3. Subjects' Performance of the Third Question

This question measures the subjects' ability to use the inflectional suffixes in pluralization. **Table (9)** displays the responses of each item. The total number of the correct responses is (497), i.e., (33.13%), whereas that of the incorrect ones is (1003), i.e., (66.87%).

Table (9)**Subjects' Performance at the Production Level of Question (3)**

No. of Item	No. of CRs	%	No. of IRs	%
1	66	44	84	56
2	42	28	108	72
3	67	44.67	83	55.33
4	56	37.33	94	62.67
5	42	28	108	72
6	51	34	99	66
7	17	11.33	133	88.67
8	56	37.33	94	62.67
9	41	27.33	109	72.67
10	59	39.33	91	60.67
Total	497	33.13	1003	66.87

Incorrect responses have been ordered according to their types from the commonest type (**601**) which adds up to (**40.07%**) to the least common one (**112**) which adds up to (**7.47%**). They are as follows: **See (Table 10)**

Table (10)
Errors Made in Responses to Question (3)

Types of Error	No.	%
1- Wrong pluralization	601	40.07
2- Wrong choice of the required responses	290	19.33
3- Giving no response	112	7.47
total	1003	66.87

1- Wrong pluralization

This error appeared in (601) with a percentage of (40.07). In this type of error, the subjects failed to use the correct inflectional affixes to obtain correct pluralization.

Here is a list of items: 1, 2, 4, 8 and 9, which reflect the wrong pluralization:

*mousse	mice
*gooses	geese
*companys	companies
*sheeps	sheep
*deers	deer

2- Wrong choice of the required responses

This type of error occupies the second rank among the other types of errors as shown in (Table 10) This type of error forms (290),i.e., (19.33%). It can be described as filling the blanks with the incorrect responses which do not complete the sentences in spite of their correct formation.

Here are items: 8, 9 and 10 which illustrate this type of error:

- * The farmer's deer and some wild aircraft were sometimes alarmed by low-flying sheep.

Instead of:

The farmer's sheep and some wild deer were sometimes alarmed by aircrafts.

3- Giving no response

Because of the subjects' carelessness the items are left without answers.. Here is a list of items: 4, 5, 6 and 7:

- * _____ companies
- * _____ keys
- * _____ stories
- * _____ delays

The above mentioned types of errors reveal the second hypothesis which states that as for inflectional nominal affixes such learners face difficulties in making pluralization. Moreover, they are unable to make the necessary morphological changes in order to avoid incorrect spelling. This is the last type of error totaled (112), i.e., (7.47)

4.2.4. Subjects' Performance of the fourth Question

This question deals with the production level too. It measures the subjects' ability to derive nouns from isolated words, which are from different classes: verbs, adjectives, and nouns.

Table (11) shows the number of the responses of each item. The total number of the correct responses is (341) which constitutes (22.73%), whereas that of the incorrect ones is (1159) which constitutes (77.27%).

Table (11)**Subjects' Performance at the Production Level of Question (4)**

No. of Item	No. of CRs	%	No. of IRs	%
1	57	38	93	62
2	22	14.7	128	85.3
3	48	32	102	68
4	50	33.3	100	66.7
5	22	14.6	128	85.3
6	33	22	117	78
7	20	13.3	130	86.7
8	47	31.3	103	68.7
9	21	14	129	86
10	21	14	129	86
Total	341	22.73	1159	77.27

The following table presents the classification of errors which are arranged according to their types from the commonest (475), i.e., (31.67%) to the least common one (104), i.e., (6.93%). See (Table 12

Table (12)**Errors Made in Responses to Question (4)**

Type of error	No.	%
1- Failure to use the required suffix	475	31.67
2- Incorrect spelling	454	30.27
3- Giving no response	126	8.4
4- Using the same words without any change	104	6.93
Total	1159	77.27

1- Failure to use the required suffix

This type of error is made in (475) answers which constitute (31.67%). When examining this error, it can be noticed that some of the subjects use wrong nominal suffixes while others use adjectival or verbal ones. Items: 1, 4, 6, 8 and 10, reflect this type of error:

*beautifully	beauty:
*adviser	advice
*denyness	denial
*tigerment	tigress
*novelor	novelist

2- Giving the correct suffixes with incorrect spelling

This type of error appeared in (454) answers, i.e., (30.27%) which occupies the second rank among other types as shown in (Table 12). This type of error is illustrated in items: 2, 3, 6, 7, 8 and 10:

*length	length
*lazyness	laziness
*denyal	denial
*authrity	authority
*tigeress	tigress
*novlest	novelist

3- Giving no response

This type of error totaled (126), adding up to (8.4%). Here is a list which contains the wrong items: 1, 4, 6, 7, 8 and 10:

- * _____ beauty
- * _____ advice
- * _____ denial
- * _____ authority, authorship
- * _____ tigress
- * _____ novelist

4- Using the same words without any change

This type of errors amounts to **(104)** non-responses, i.e., **(6.93%)**. When examining this error, it can be noticed that the subjects write the given items as they are without any change as a result of their lack of linguistic knowledge as in items: 1,2,4,7,8 and 10:

- *beautiful beauty
- *long length
- *advise advice
- *author authority, authorship
- *tiger tigress
- *novel novelist

4.2.5. Subjects' Performance of the Fifth Question

The fifth question measures the subjects' ability to produce the correct nouns in order to complete the sentences. **Table (13)** presents the responses to each item. The total number of the correct responses is **(577)**, i.e., **(38.47%)**, whereas that of the incorrect ones is **(923)**, i.e., **(61.53%)**.

Table (13)

Subjects' Responses at the Production Level of Question (5)

No. of Item	No. of CRs	%	No. of IRs	%
1	69	43.33	81	56.67
2	88	58.67	62	41.33
3	70	46.67	80	53.33
4	54	36	96	64
5	70	46.67	80	53.33
6	20	13.33	130	86.67
7	63	41.33	87	58.67
8	22	14.67	128	85.33
9	60	42.67	90	57.33
10	61	40.67	89	59.33
Total	577	38.47	923	61.53

The incorrect responses are classified into three groups according to their types. They have been ordered from the commonest type (**606**) which adds up to (**40.4%**) to the least one (**97**) which adds up to (**6.47%**). They are classified as follows:

1- Using the wrong suffixes

This type appeared in (**606**) which constitutes (**40.4%**). When examining this error, it can be noticed that most of the incorrect used suffixes are nominal as in items: 1, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8 and 10:

*holihood	holiness
*poorness	poverty
*truing	truth
*destrosion	destruction
*efficiencie	efficiency
*failing	failure
*hungeriness	hunger

2- Incorrect spelling

In this type of error which constitutes (220), i.e., (14.67 %), some of the subjects either use the correct suffixes with incorrect spelling as in items: 1, 3, 4 and 6:

*holyness	holiness
*poverity	poverty
*trueth	truth
*destroction	destruction

or they produce both the wrong suffixes and incorrect spelling as in items:

*boriness	boringdom
*succing	success
*effication	efficiency
*justification	justice

3- Giving no responses

This type occupies the last rank among other types, it appeared in (97) non-responses, adding up to (6.47%) of the total number of errors in this

question. Here is a list of some of the items: 2, 6, 8, 9 and 10 which are avoided. See (Table 14):

- * _____ boringdom
- * _____ destruction
- * _____ failure
- * _____ justice

Table (14)
Errors Made in Responses to Question (5)

Type of Error	No.	%
1- Using the wrong suffixes	606	40.4
2- Incorrect spelling	220	14.67
3- Giving no response	97	6.47
Total	923	61.53

Table (15) shows that the subjects' performance of the question five is better than that of the question four, i.e., the subjects' ability to form nouns inside the context is better than that out of the context, i.e, in isolation. In **Q4**, the total number of the incorrect responses is (**1159**) which adds up to (**77.27%**). In Q5, the total number of the correct responses is (**577**) which constitutes (**38.47%**), whereas that of the incorrect ones is (**923**) which constitutes (**61.53%**) This validates the third hypothesis which states that the subjects' performance in context is better than that of the isolated items, see (Table 15).

Table (15)

**Subjects' Total Performance at the Production Level of Questions
(4 and 5)**

No. of Q	No. of CRs	%	No. of IRs	%
4	341	22.79	1159	77.27
5	577	38.47	923	61.53
Total	918	30.69	2082	69.31

The subjects' total performance in the last three questions can be summed up in **Table (16)**:

Table (16)

**Subjects' Total Performance at the Production Level of Questions
(3, 4 and 5)**

No. of Q	No. of CRs	%	No. of IRs	%
3	497	33.13	1003	66.87
4	341	22.79	1159	77.27
5	577	38.47	923	61.53
Total	1415	31.50	3085	68.56

***4.2.6. Subjects' Performance of Nominal Affixes of the
Whole Test***

The results of the subjects' performance in the whole test is presented in **(Table 17)** with regard to the recognition and production levels:

Table (17)
Subjects' Performance at the Recognition and Production Levels of
the Whole Test

Level	No. of CRs	%	No. of IRs	%
Recognition	1428	47.6	1572	52.4
Production	1415	31.50	3085	68.56
Total	2843	37.91	4657	62.09

The highest rate of the subjects' incorrect responses is **(3085)**, i.e., **(68.56%)** at the production level, whereas the total number of the incorrect responses is **(1572)**, i.e., **(52.4%)** at the recognition one. This means that the Iraqi EFL college students face difficulty in mastering the NAs on both levels. The subjects' successful performance at the production level is lower than that at the recognition one. The subjects face more difficulties at the production level since the total number of their correct responses (**1415**) which adds up to **(31.50)** is lower than that of their correct ones at the recognition one **(1428)** which adds up to **(47.6 %)**.

These results can also be confirmed by using certain measures such as the mean and coefficient variation. The mean for the production level **(18.87)** is lower than that for the recognition level **(19.04)** while the coefficient variation for the production **(41.14%)** is higher than that for the recognition one **(37.37)**. This validates the fourth hypothesis which states that the subjects' achievement at the recognition level is better than their achievement at the production one.

4.3. Sources of Errors

It can be said that identification of the exact source of errors made by the foreign learners cannot be completely accurate. Furthermore, an error may be attributed to more than one source. In accounting for particular errors made by a learner, there is a large area of uncertainty and speculation. In many cases there appear to be several simultaneous processes going on: transfer, overgeneralization, faulty categorization, lapses and syntactic blends which operate in the planning and execution of utterances (Corder, 1973:290).

It is not always possible to identify the source of error that a learner of a foreign language makes. The purpose of describing the results of a test is to provide test developers and test users with a picture of how the students performed it (Mukattash, 1980:144).

The study of errors is part of the psycholinguistic search for the universal processes of second language learning.. Describing the errors is a comparative process, it is rather like the task a linguist faces when trying to describe a hitherto undescribed and unrecorded language.

Mistakes are a natural part of the learning process.
Language is a complex phenomenon, and language learning is a correspondingly complex activity. Many factors contribute towards the success or failure of the individual language learner. (Lewis and Hill, 1990:90)

There is a number of factors that interact and influence the linguistic performance of a second or a foreign language learner. They include

language transfer, intralingual interference, context of learning and communicative strategies (Kardaleska, 2005:1).

4.3.1. Language Learning Strategies (LLSs)

Language learning strategies (henceforth LLSs) refer to particular methods of approaching problems or tasks, modes of operation for achieving particular ends, planned designs for controlling and manipulating certain information (Brown, 1980:83).

LLSs have three types. The first two are interlingual transfer and intralingual transfer which represent two prominently different linguistic manifestations of one psychological process while the last is a context of learning.

4.3.1.1. Interlingual Transfer

The term “interlanguage” refers to contrastive analysis which deals with the differences and similarities between the native language of the learner and the target language.

Interlanguage is seen as a separate linguistic system resulting from the learner’s attempted production of five central cognitive processes involved in the second-language learning:

- 1- Language transfer: some items, rules, and subsystems of the interlanguage may result from transfer from the L1.
- 2- Transfer of training, some elements of the inter language may result from specific features of the training process used to teach the second language.

- 3- Strategies of second-language learning, some elements of the interlanguage may result from specific approach to the material to be learned.
- 4- Strategies of second-language communication, some elements of the interlanguage may result from specific ways people learn to communicate with native speakers of the target language.
- 5- Overgeneralization of the target language linguistic material, some elements of the interlanguage may be the product of overgeneralization of the rules and semantic features of the target language (Barry, 1991:101).

L1 and L2 may be learned simultaneously or successively, L2 may be learned in either an L1 or an L2 environment; in the former case, L2 is learned through verbal contact with native speakers.

Psycholinguists predict that the nature of the mother tongue will facilitate or make difficult the learning of certain aspects of the target language. A comparative study of the two languages identifies certain features of the second language as different from those of the mother tongue and predicts that the learner will find them difficult. Thus, the study of errors is part of an experiment to confirm or disprove the psycholinguistic theory of “transfer” (ibid :60).

Interlanguage refers to the intermediate grammars constructed by second language learners on their way to the target language. Interlingual transfer may be either positive, when a L1 pattern, identical with a L2 pattern, is transferred, or it can be negative, when a L1 pattern, different from the target language, is transferred. Therefore, interlingual problems

depend, to a great extent, on the linguistic differences between L1 and L2 which are traditionally known as “interference problems”.

Translation may lead to L1 interference by which the learner can transfer forms from his L1 to the L2 he is learning. Thus when he translates the words in his L1 he notices the changes that occur as he derives nouns from given words (Ells et al, 1987:52). The amount of interference is determined, among other factors, by the degree of ‘translatability’ between L1 and L2.

In both languages, the production of nouns is produced by affixation or conversion, items: 5, 6, 8 and 9 in Q4:

treat	→	treatment	يعامل ، معاملة
deny	→	denial	تنكر ، نكران
tiger	→	tigress	نمر ، نمرة
smoke	→	smoker, smoking	يدخن، مدخن، تدخين

The incorrect spelling shows the negative interlingual transfer. In the subjects’ native language, the necessary changes can be internal and external whereas in the target language, these changes should be only external. Five items in Q1 can be ascribed to negative interlingual transfer: 3, 5, 7, 8 and 10:

*jalousiy	jealousy
*invatein	invitation
*exciatment	excitement
*arriaveal	arrival

*seponful spoonful

Items : 1, 2, 4, 7 and 8 in Q4 reflect incorrect spelling as a result of negative interlingual transfer too:

*beutation beauty

*loenth length

*aedvisation advice

*aauthority authority

*taigeress tigress

Items: 1, 3, 7, 9 and 10 reflect this transfer too:

*hoolyness holiness

*pooverity poverty

*eaficiencie efficiency

*jeustis justice

*hanngriion hunger

All the above-mentioned examples show the internal and external changes in the subjects' responses. These changes reveal the influence of L1 since the subjects need such changes in order to produce nouns in their mother tongue.

The researcher notices that **(126)** errors that might be attributed to the interlingual transfer, i.e., **(2.71%)** of the total number of the subjects' errors. This implies that the reliance of the subject on his native language decreases as he progresses in second language learning. This can justify the low rate of the subjects' interference errors.

4.3.1.2. Intralingual Transfer

The term “intralingual transfer” refers to the error which deals with explanation of errors which result from a complex structure of the target language itself. Thus, not all errors can be attributed to the linguistic differences between the two languages.

Advanced stages in the course of learning a second language are characterized by intralingual transfer. This transfer can be positive as in overgeneralization, which refers to the derivation of a rule. However, it may be negative when the students are unable to produce nouns correctly, they tend to replace one affix instead of another , as in items: 2, 3, 6 and 7 in Q1:

*freeness	freedom
*jealousation	jealousy
*historist	historian
*excitation	excitement

There are intralingual lexical errors as in: producing wrong words as a result of phonetic relatedness within L2, as in items: 5, 6, 7 and 9 in Q5:

*succs	success
*destrucscion	destruction
*justise	justice

Interlingual problems depend on linguistic differences between L1 and L2 and are traditionally interpreted as interference problems while

intralingual problems cannot be traced back to differences between L1 and L2; but they are related to a specific interpretation of the target language and manifest themselves as universal phenomena.

Negative intralingual transfer, on the other hand, can be marked in the following three types of errors:

1- Error of Negative Overgeneralization

Overgeneralization can be found in both L1 and L2 learning. L1 and L2 learners have the cognitive capacity for making hypotheses about the language they are learning and that both use many similar procedures or strategies.

These errors refer to the unacceptable extension of an acquired rule to items which cannot be covered by that rule, i.e., the inappropriate application of a rule causes deviant forms of the L2 (Richards, 1971:199).

Taylor (1975:74) views overgeneralization in language learning as “a process in which a language learner uses a syntactic rule of the target language inappropriately when he attempts to generate a novel target language utterances.”

Errors of overgeneralization signify the active role of the learner as a participant in the process of language learning, since he is utilizing his proficiency of the L2 in a creative manner, i.e., he is neither transferring his mother tongue patterns nor imitating what he hears around him of the L2 system.

There are representative examples of overgeneralization as in items: 1, 3, 3, 8 and 9 in Q3:

*mouses	mice
*gooses	geese
*foots	feet
sheeps	sheep
*deers	deer

Ellis (1984:53) states: “when rules are extended to contexts in the target usage where they do not apply.” This can result from analogical extension, as in using gerundive forms more than derived ones. Items: 6 and 8 in Q5 reflect this error:

*destroying	destruction
*failing	failure

The subjects overgeneralize the rule which derives agent nominals from nouns. Items 6 and 10 in Qs (1 and 4) reveal this error:

*historist	historian
*novelian	novelist

The subjects overgeneralize the rule which derives nouns from adjectives which end with {-ent} or {-ant}. This is reflected in item 7 in Q5:

*effeciencie	efficiency
--------------	------------

The vast majority of the subjects' errors is caused by overgeneralization which totaled (1677) with a percentage of (36.01).

2- Errors of Simplification

Errors of simplification result from omitting some grammatical elements. Simplification refers to the way in which learners seek to ease the burden of learning or using a second language by controlling the number of hypotheses they try to form at any one stage of development, or by omitting grammatical elements (Richards,1974:220)

Incorrect spelling can sometimes result by simplicity. The subjects only use affixes that they consider correct without correct spelling. Besides, the subjects use gerundive forms rather than derived ones, this can also be attributed to the simplicity of the {-ing} form compared to the derived nominals, as in items: 4, 5 and 6 in Q4:

*advising	advice
*treating	treatment
*denying	denial

Errors of simplification form (85), i.e., (1.83%) of the total number of the subjects' errors.

3- Errors of Ignorance of Rule Restrictions

These errors result either from analogical extension as in using adjectival and verbal affixes , as in items: 2, 4, 6 and 7 in Q4:

*lungful	length
*adviser	advice
*denyless	denial
*authoritive	authority, authorship

or from the necessary changes as in the letter (**y**) which should be changed into (**i**) when it is preceded by consonants, e.g. items: 1, 4 and 6 in Q1:

*likelyhood	likelihood
* marriage	marriage
*historyan	historian

In addition, there are other examples which are related to this source of errors as in replacing the letter (**a**) at the end of a given word instead of the letter (**e**) as in items 5 and 8 in Q1:

*invitetion	invitation
*arriveal	arrival

Items 4, 6 in Q3, 3, and 6 in Q4: reflect this error too:

*companyes	companies
*storyes	stories
*lazyness	laziness
*denyal	denial

This type of errors constitutes (**78**) adding up to (**1.67%**) of the total number of the subjects' errors.

4- False Concepts Hypothesized

It may derive from faulty comprehension of a distinction in the target language (Chanier *et al*, 1992:134).

Accordingly, the subjects in this study could not recognize that there are affixes which can be used to derive nouns as well as adjectives, as in {-y, -al , ful}. When examining such affixes, it can be noticed that most of the subjects avoid using them because of their lack of linguistic knowledge about such affixes .Items: 3, 8 and 10 in Q1 reflect this error:

*jealousness	jealousy
*arrivence	arrival
*spooness	spoonful

(247, 3.83%) of errors may be ascribed to ignorance of rule restriction.

Table (18) presents the distribution of errors according to their sources in the intralingual transfer strategies hierarchically:

Table (18)
Errors Made by the intralingual strategies

Source of Error	No. of Error	%
1- Overgeneralization	1677	36.01
2-False concepts hypothesized	247	3.83
3- Simplification	85	1.83
4- Ignorance of rule restrictions	78	1.67
Total	2087	44.81

4.3.1.3. Context of Learning

This source overlaps with both types of the previously mentioned factors, i.e., interlingual and intralingual transfer. The word “context” refers to the classroom with its teacher and its material. There is a logical relationship between what goes on in the classroom and the preparation of syllabuses and teaching material. The ease or difficulty of learning is not simply related to the nature of the task but has components of motivation, intelligence, aptitude and quality of teachers and teaching materials (Corder, 1973:140).

One of the theoretical objectives in error analysis is the explanation of how errors come about. This is a psychological explanation in terms of the learner’s strategies and the process of learning (ibid).

The most obvious practical use of the analysis of errors is to the teacher. Errors provide feedback, they tell the teacher something about the effectiveness of his teaching materials and his teaching techniques and show him what parts of the syllabus he has been following have been inadequately learned or taught and need further attention. They enable him to decide whether he can move on to the next item on the syllabus or whether he must devote more time to the item. They provide the information for designing remedial syllabus or a programme of reteaching (ibid: 265).

Errors may come from the influence of the situation of learning (the classroom), the misleading explanation by the teacher, or the textbook

writer who emphasizes some aspects of the target language and others, according to his beliefs and experiences. All these factors may have the undesired effect of motivation the learner to make faulty hypotheses about language (Richards, 1974:178).

In this study, the most obvious case which can reveal the influence of the context of learning is that NAs are presented in the case of isolated items, out of the context, widely.

In the fifth question, the role of the context is clear since most of the subjects use only nominal affixes, they do not use other affixes (adjectival or verbal), as in items 1, 5, 7 and 9 in Q5:

*holiaton	holiness
*succeedness	success
*efficienty	efficiency
*juster	justice

Another problem attributed to this factor is the limit exposure to nominal prefixes. The subjects ignore most of such affixes, as in items: 1, 6, 8 and 10 in Q2:

*exstop	nonstop
*subform	uniform
*coway	subway
*nonfunction	malfunction

These errors form **(353, 7.58%)** of the total number of the subjects' errors.

4.3.2. Communication Strategies (CSs)

Communicative strategies indicate the actual use of language (verbal, nonverbal contact) in order to communicate a thought when the exact linguistic forms are not available to the learner during the process of communication (Brown, 1987:91).

It is hypothesized by Richards (1974:117) that both strategies of learning a second language and strategies of communication are markers of transitional competence, i.e., developmental sequences by which the learner masters the rules of the target language system, but the differences between LLSs and CSs reveals the significance of difference between seeing language as a set of habits to be learnt through ‘conditioning’ on the one hand, and seeing it as ‘competence’ built in the human minds of all speakers of all languages on the other, and between those two views on the one hand, and the view that communicative competence progresses and develops through situational learning, on the other.

Thus, the emphasis is on the communicative competence rather than on the linguistic competence. In the present study, because of lack of the linguistic knowledge, the subjects’ errors result from either reduction strategies or avoidance strategies. Corder (1973:104) uses the term “risk-avoidance” or “message adjustment” for the first strategies and the term “risk-taking” or “resources expansion” for the second ones.

4.3.2.1. Risk-Avoidance Strategies

There are two types of risk-avoidance strategies:

1- Topic Avoidance

It is a refusal to enter onto or continue a discourse within some field or topic because of a feeling of total linguistic inadequacy (ibid).

In this study, the subjects do not write anything because of their total lack of linguistic knowledge, they have nothing to write. Items:1, 2, 4 and 8 in Q4 reflect this error:

- * _____ beauty
- * _____ length
- * _____ advice
- * _____ tigress

Errors of this type form **(215, 4.61%)** of the total number of the subjects' errors.

2- Message-Abandonment

This error occurs when L2 learner begins to answer but suddenly he stops because it is too difficult for him to continue, i.e., “trying but giving up” (Brown,1987:183). Thus, the subjects write only the same given words without any changes. Items: 2, 3, 6 and 8 in Q5 show this type of error:

- *boring boringdom
- *poor poverty
- *destroy destruction
- *fail failure

Errors of this type are totaled **(301. 6.46%)**.

4.3.2.2. Risk-Taking Strategies

There are three types of risk-taking strategies:

1- Approximation

The use of a single target language vocabulary item or structure, which the learner knows is not correct, shares enough semantic features in

common with the desired item to satisfy the speaker, e.g., pipe for water pipe (ibid).

Here are some examples which show approximation in which the subjects try to achieve the required item by replacing other different NAs instead of the correct ones, as in items: 4, 6 and 8 in Q4:

*adviseness advice

*denition denial

*tigerness tigrress

In Q5, items: 3, 9 and 10 illustrate approximation by using “the+adjective” or “being+adjective”. These items do not complete the sentences in spite of their correct formation:

*Being poor is one of the world’s problems. (poverty)

*There should be the just in any society. (justice)

*The baby is crying because of the hungry. (hunger)

Error of approximation forms (240, 5.15%) out of (4657) incorrect responses of the whole test.

2- Word Coinage

It occurs when the L2 learners make up a new word in order to communicate a desired concept. Unseriousness and lack of intelligence make the subjects make up strange words, which could not be explained.

The total number of errors that are possibly due to this type is (10, 0.21). Items: 7, 10, and 10 in Qs 3, 4 and 5 respectively illustrate these errors:

*keiss keys

*novella novelist

*hungrsy hunger

3- Circumlocution

Circumlocution occurs when the L2 learner, instead of using the correct and direct answer, describes the elements or characteristics of that item. The total number of circumlocution is **(75, 1.61%)**.

Examples of circumlocution are identified in items: 7, 8 and 10 in Q4:

*writer of story authority, authorship
*wife of tiger tigress
*maker story novelist

Besides, circumlocution is also found in items: 3, 6 and 10 in Q5:

*not rich poverty
*breaking down destruction
*no eating hunger

The distribution of errors for the three types of risk-taking strategies are presented hierarchically in the following table.

Table (19)
Errors Made by the Risk-Taking Strategies

Source of Error	No.	%
1- Approximation	240	5.15
2- Circumlocution	75	1.61
3- Word coinage	10	0.21
Total	325	6.98

4.3.2.3. *Guessing*

Errors of guessing can be attributed to the subjects' unseriousness and lack of linguistic knowledge, since they choose and produce irrelevant responses.

Guessing is found mainly in Q2, which demands that the students should choose the most appropriate prefixes, which complete the meaning of the sentences. Most subjects choose these prefixes randomly without understanding them. Examples illustrating guessing in items: 2, 3 and 4 in Q1 are :

*freeness	freedom
*jealousness	jealousy
*marryhood	marriage

The total number of errors that may be attributed to guessing is (**1250, 26.84%**). In Q2, the following items: 1, 4, 6, 7 and 10 reflect guessing too:

*prestop	nonstop
*unwork	overwork
*nonform	uniform
*prewar	postwar
*cofunction	malfunction

Table (20) presents the distribution of errors which are yielded by the types of communication strategies hierarchically.

Table (20)

Errors Made by the Communication Strategies

Source of Error	No.	%
1- Guessing	1250	26.84
2- Risk-avoidance strategies	516	11.08
3- Risk-taking strategies	325	6.98
Total	2091	44.90

The following table shows the rate of errors for these factors hierarchically.

Table (21)

Errors Made by the Language Learning and Communication Strategies

Type of Strategy	No.	%
1- Communication Strategies	2091	44.90
2- Intralingual transfer	2087	44.81
3- Context of learning	353	7.58
4- Interlingual transfer	126	2.71
Total	4657	100

Chapter Five

Conclusions; Recommendations and Suggestions

Chapter Five

Conclusions, Recommendations, and Suggestions

5.1. Introduction

This chapter sums up the main conclusions arrived at throughout the theoretical work of this study as well as the results of the test. In addition, these conclusions are meant to serve as a basis for the pedagogical recommendations and suggestions for further investigations in the area of NAs.

5.2. Practical Conclusions

The empirical work of the study has come up with the following conclusions:

1-Iraqi EFL college students at their third stage face difficulties in recognizing and producing NAs. This is indicated by their low performance in the main test, as the rate of their correct responses (**37.91%**) is lower significantly than that of their incorrect ones (**62.09%**). This validates the first hypothesis.

2- At the production level, the findings of data analysis show the subjects' incompetence to pluralize nouns and produce incorrect spelling. The rate of their incorrect responses is (**66.87%**) whereas that of the correct ones is (**33.13%**). This validates the second hypothesis.

3- The subject's low performance ,in question four, has revealed that the students face more difficulty in forming nouns from given words in isolation , than in context. In isolated items, the subjects fail to use the correct nominal suffixes; they use other affixes, adjectival, verbal, etc. The rate of their correct responses is (**22.73%**), whereas that of the incorrect ones is (**77.27%**). In context, the subjects' wrong responses are limited to using only the wrong nominal affixes. The rate of their correct responses is (**38.47 %**) while that of the incorrect ones is (**61.53%**). This reveals that the context expresses the functional and the positional properties of nouns and helps the students use only the nominal affixes in order to produce the correct nouns which complete the sentences. This verifies the third hypothesis.

4- The subjects' performance in the whole test has also revealed that EFL college students encounter more difficulties in using NAs at the production level than at the recognition one. The subjects' performance at the recognition level has obtained a mean of (**19.04**) against a mean of (**18.87**) at the production level. This validates the fourth hypothesis of the present study.

5- The plausible causes underlying the subjects' poor performance can be ascribed to the following factors arranged hierarchically according to the frequency of errors attributed to each:

I. Intralingual transfer which constitutes the majority of the subjects' errors as it accounts for (**44.81%**) of their total errors. The subjects' reliance on the prior knowledge of the target language rules to recognize or produce NAs regardlessness of their acceptability is due to the incomplete understanding of such affixes which encourages

overgeneralization, simplification, incomplete application of a rule and false concept hypothesized.

II. Communication strategies which the subjects resort to in their attempt to structure what they mean. The rate of error pertaining to such factors is **(44.90)** of all the subjects' errors.

III. Context of learning as the nominal prefixes have not been given due attention in the grammar books in general, and in the subjects' textbooks in particular. Furthermore, NAs have been presented widely in isolation. This leads to the subjects' incompetence. Errors attributed to this factor constitute **(7.58%)**.

IV. Interlingual interference whereby the subjects use the rules of their native language in the production of NAs. In this respect, the use of translation is the most common phenomenon. The rate of interference errors is **(2.71%)** of all the subjects' errors.

5.3. Pedagogical Implications and Recommendations

In the light of the findings arrived at in this study, the following pedagogical implications can be posited:

1- The problem with the present syllabus in the Department of English, as far as NAs are concerned, is that the material presented to the students is limited to some nominal suffixes while nominal prefixes are neglected. This is, of course, the reason behind the subjects' unfamiliarity with such prefixes. In a pedagogical situation, it makes sense then for the syllabus designers to expose students to such

affixes. In this way, the students will have ample opportunity to be familiar with them and their errors can be reduced to a minimum.

- 2- A kind of deductive treatment in teaching nominalizing affixes is necessary at the beginning stages. Students should be provided with rules of grammar that govern the use and formation of NAs. This should be done only after a lot of drilling and practice. .
- 3- During the preceding process, a clear distinction should be drawn among the affixes which can function as nominal and adjectival.
- 4- NAs that require necessary changes in spelling should be emphasized in teaching and testing.
- 5- Too much dependence on recognition tests does not measure the production ability of learners. The types of tests recommended here are those which guarantee that the following aspects are tested: correct formation, the ability to use the suitable affixes, and the ability to derive correct nouns and use them in controlled utterances.
- 6- The presentation of the NAs is preferred in contexts. Since the positional, functional and formal features could be shown in context, this helps the students recognize and produce well.
- 7- There should be correct repetition and continuous exposure to NAs in the classroom. The teacher should use authentic materials which include NAs. The researcher sees that the repetition and exposure to NAs are the best solutions.
- 8- The results of this study can be of use to teachers and syllabus designers as they provide the necessary information for the

preparation of remedial teaching programmes that can enhance the subjects' competence in using NAs, and thus helping them overcome the difficulties they encounter in this area.

5.4. Suggestions for Further Work

In the light of the results of the present study, the following topics are suggested to be studied:

- 1- Errors made by Iraqi EFL students in using other affixes such as adjectival and verbal affixes.
- 2- Similar affixes which produce adjectives as well as nouns such as **{-al, -ing, -ful,-y, etc.}**. When examining these affixes, it can be noticed that they are presented widely in textbooks as adjectival rather than nominal.
- 3- A contrastive study of the inflection and derivation of nouns in English and Arabic.

Bibliography

- Ackert, Patricia.2002. *Concept and Comments*. Arizona. The Dryden Press.
- Al-Hamash, K. and Jamal J.1979. *A Course in Modern English Grammar*. Baghdad: A Publication of IDELTI.
- _____ and Younis,H.1980. *Principles and Techniques of Teaching English as a Second Language*. Baghdad: A Publication of IDELTI.
- Al-Jumaily, S.1987.*Inflerctional Suffixes in English with Relevance to Teaching English in Iraqi Secondary Schools*. Unpublished M.A. Thesis: University of Baghdad.
- Al-Kawaz, Z.2002. *Iraqi EFL College Students' Recognition and Production of English Nominalization*. Unpublished M.A. Thesis: University of Baghdad.
- Anderson, S.1992.*A-Morphous Morphology*.Cambridg: Cambridge University Press.
- Antworth, A.1995.*A Computational Morphology of English*. Internet.www.sit.org/pckimmo/vz/doc/englex.htm
- Aronoff, M.1976.*Word Formation in Generative Grammar*. London: MIT Press.
- Ascham, R.2005.The *English Language*. Internet. Indoeuro.bizland.com/tree/germ/English/htm
- Azar,B.S.1999.*Understanding and Using English Grammar*.3 ed. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Barry, M. 1991. *Theories of Second Language Learning*. London: Edward Arnold.

- Bauer, L.1983.*English Word-Formation*. London: CUP.
- Bierwish,M.1989. *Event Nominalizations*. Berlin: Akademieder.
- Blakey,T.N.1987.*English for Maritime Studies*. New Jersey:
Prentice Hall, Inc..
- Blisset, C. and Hall G.1997. *A Very Simple Grammar of English*. New
York: Pearl Offset Press.
- Bloomfield, L.1958. *Language* .New York: Henry Holt.
- Branigan, P.2004.*Linguistics Morphology and Syntax*. New York:
Memorial University Press.
- Broukal, M. 2003. *TOEFL Grammar Flash*. Canada: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Brown, D. 1987. *Principles of Language Learning and Teaching* .2nd
ed. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hill, Inc.
- _____ . 1996. *Testing in Language Programmes*. Englewood Cliffs:
Prentice-Hill, Inc.
- Brown, E.K. and J.E. Miller. 1980. *Syntax: A Linguistic Introduction to
Sentence Structure*. London: Hutchinson Melbourne Sydney.
- Carroll, B.J. 1980. *Testing Communicative Performance: An Interim
Study*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Chae, H. 2004. *Gerund Phrases as NPs with N Heads: No Empty
or Mixed Categories*. New York: Hong Kong University
Press.
- Chalker, S. 1984. *Current English Grammar*. London: Macmillan
Publishers.
- Chambers English Dictionary*. 1989. Cambridge: W and R Chambers
Ltd.

- Chanier, T.; M. Pengelly; M. Twidale and J. Self. 1992. "***Conceptual Modelling in Error Analysis in Computer-Assisted Language Learning System***". Internet. <http://www.kkhec.ac.ir/Linguistics20%20articles%20index%20Conceptual%20Modelling%20inError%20Analysis.htm>
- Close, R. A. 1974. ***A University Grammar of English*** (Workbook). London: Longman.
- Corder, S.P. 1973. ***Introducing Applied Linguistics***. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books. Ltd.
- _____. 1985. ***An Intermediate English***. (Workbook). Hong Kong.
- Crystal, D. 1991. ***A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics***. Oxford : Oxford University Press.
- Cureton, R.D. 2005. E.E. Cummings: ***A Study of the Poetic Use of Deviant Morphology. Linguistics***. University of Illinois. Internet. www.tan.ac.il/humanities/publications/poetics/art/eec12.htm
- Curme, G. O. 1953. ***English Grammar***. New York: Barnes, Inc.
- Derbyshire, A.E. 1967. ***A Description of English***. London: Edward Arnold (Publishers)LTD.
- Davies, A. 1990. ***Principles of Language Testing***. T.J. Press.
- Davies, E. 1986. ***The English Imperatives***. London. Croon Helm Ltd.
- Disciullo, A. and Edwin Williams. 1987. ***On the Definition of Word***. London: MLT Press Ltd.
- Ebel, R. 1972. ***Essential of Educational Measurement***. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice- Hall.

- Eckersley, C.E. and J. M. Eckersley. 1960. *A Comprehensive English Grammar*. London: Longman.
- Ellis, R. 1984. *Classroom Second Development: A Study of Classroom Interaction and Language Acquisition*. London: Pergamon Press Ltd.
- Ellis, T.; Theo B. ; Guus E. ; Charles V. ; Anne M. and Van D. 1987. *Applied Linguistics and Learning and Teaching of Foreign Languages*. London: Edward Arnold (Publishers) Ltd.
- Finocchiaro, M. 1970. *English as a Second Language: from Theory to Practice*. New York: Simon and Schuster, Inc.
- _____ and Michael B. 1973. *The Foreign Language Learner. A Guide for Teachers*. Oxford: Regents Publishing Company, Inc.
- Fitikides, T. J. 2002. *Common Mistakes in English*. Malaysia: Pearson Education Limited.
- Frank, M. 1972. *Modern English : A Practical English Guide*. Englewood Cliffs, N. J. : Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Fries, C. 1952. *The Structure of English*. New York: Har Court, Brace and CO.
- Frost, h. 2001. *On Target English Sentence and Word Skills*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh Gate.
- Galasso, J. 2003. *Analyzing English Grammar: An Introduction to Feature Theory*. Internet. [www.csun.edu/~galasso/complete handbook5.htm](http://www.csun.edu/~galasso/complete%20handbook5.htm).
- Gardner, R.C. and L. Gliks. 2001. "On "Gardner on Affect". A Discussion of Validity as It Relates to Attitude/ Motivation

Test Battery: A Response from Gardner” in *Language Learning Journal*. Vol. 32, No. 1.

Gethin, H. 1983. *Grammar in Context*. London: William Collins Sons And Co. Ltd.

Gleason, H. 1961. *An Introduction to Description Linguistics* New Parl: Halt Rinehart and Watson.

Graham, S. 1982. *Harbrace College (Workbook)*. Berlin: University of Tennessee Press.

Halle, M. 1993. *Distributed Morphology and the Pieces of Inflection*. Cambridge. MA. MLT Press.

Harris, D.P. 1969. *Testing English as a Second Language*. New York: McGraw-Hill Inc.

Heaton, J.B. 1988. *Writing English Language Tests*. London: Longman.

Hornby, A.S. 2003. *Oxford Progressive English Course*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Huebener, T. 1968. *How to Teach Foreign Language Effectively*. New York: New York University Press.

Joffrey, H. 2003. *Some Word Formation*. Lang Marker Com.

Internet.[www.in the beginning-org/ntgreek/lesson 6/ pdf](http://www.inthebeginning-org/ntgreek/lesson6/pdf)

Johannesson,N.L.1999. *H F 111 Grammar*.Internet.[www.hf.ntnu .no/engelsk/staff/johnnesson/111_gram/lect 21.htm](http://www.hf.ntnu.no/engelsk/staff/johnnesson/111_gram/lect21.htm)

John, L.1995. *Head Way. Pre-Intermediate*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Johnson, M. 2002.*Morphology the Structure of Words*.Internet.
[http://www.cog.brown.edu/~mj/classes/cg/hadouts/wko
20.pdf](http://www.cog.brown.edu/~mj/classes/cg/hadouts/wko20.pdf)

- Joseph, H. 2004. *Universals of Language*. London .MLT Press. Internet.. www.facstall.bucknell.edu/rbeard/wrdsyn.htm.
- Kardaleska, L. 2005. *Contrastive Analysis and Error Analysis in Combination with Analysis of the Semantic Level*. Internet. [www.english.com/contrastive analysis.htm](http://www.english.com/contrastive_analysis.htm).
- Karls, J. B. 1992. *The Writer's Handbook*. (National Text Book) London: Company Press.
- Katamba, F. 1993. *Morphology*. London: Macmillan.
- Kies, D. 1995. *Modern English Grammar*. Internet. [www.paper.com/hypertext books/engl- 126/complex 2.htm](http://www.paper.com/hypertextbooks/engl-126/complex2.htm)
- Krohn, R. 1974. *English Sentence Structure*. Michigan: The University of Michigan Press.
- Lee, Y.P. 1985. *New Directions in Language Testing*: Paper presented at the International Symposium on Language Testing. Hong Kong: Pergamon Press.
- Leech, G. 2001. *An A-Z of English Grammar and Usage*. London: Pearson Education Limited.
- Lewis, M. and Jimmie H. 1990. *Practical Techniques on Language Teaching*. Language Teaching Publications: Church Rd, Hove, BN32BE.
- Lieber, R. 1980. *On the Organization of the Lexicon*. Bloomington: IOLC.
- Lyons, J. 1968. *An Introduction to Theoretical Linguistics*. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press.
- Matthews, P . H. 1972. *Inflectional Morphology*. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press.

- Matthieson, S. J. 2003. *Essential Words for the TOEFL*. New York: Hopkins University Press.
- Mrea,P. 1982. “An Alternative Approach to Testing Grammatical Competence” in *Language Testing*. London: New Avenue Press.
- Mukattash, L. 1980. “Yes/ No Questions and the Contrastive Hypothesis” in *ELT Journal*. Vol. 4, No. 2.
- Murphy, R.2002. *English Grammar in Use*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Nesfield, J.C. and F.T. Wood . 1964. *Manual of English Grammar and Composition*. London: Macmillan.
- Nida, E. A. 1944. *Morphology: The Descriptive Analysis of Words*. New York: Institute of Linguistics.
- Olsen, S. 2005. *Morphology*. Internet. [Private.www.essex.ac.uk/~spena/572/572 ch4.pdf](http://private.www.essex.ac.uk/~spena/572/572_ch4.pdf)
- Palmer, F. 1974. *The English Verb*. London: Longman Group Ltd.
- Perol, L. 1974. *The English Language*. London: Hutchinson University Library.
- Philips, D. 1996. *Preparation Course for the TOEFL Test*. New York: Addison. Wesley Publishing Company.
- Plag, I. 2004. *Word-Formation in English*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Poesio, M. 2000. *The Gnome Annotation Scheme Manual*. Internet, http://www.here.ed.ac.uk/~gnome/anno_manual.htm.
- Pollock, C.W. 1950. *Communicate What You Mean*. London: Prentice-Hall.

- Quirk, R.; S. Greenbaum; G. Leech; and J. Svartvik. 1985. *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. London: Longman.
- Richards, J. C. (ed.). 1971. "A Non-Contrastive Approach to Error Analysis." in *ELT Journal*, Vol. 31, No. 4.
- _____. 1974. "A Non-Contrastive Approach to Error Analysis". *Error Analysis : Perspective on Second Language Acquisition*. London: Longman.
- _____; Jonathan H. and Susan P. 1993. *Intermediate English for International Communication*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Roberts, P. 1967. *Modern Grammar*. Harcourt: Brace and World, Inc.
- Sapir, A. 2005. *Word Syntax*. Internet. www.facstaff.bucknell.edu/Rbeard/wrdsyn.htm
- Sculise, D. 1984. *Word Syntax*. Internet. anylioiz.kgw.tu-berin.de/article_102_morphology.htm
- Selkirk, E. 1982. *The Syntax of Words*. Cambridge: MA. MIT Press.
- Shammas, N. A. 1999. *Use of English*. Damascus: Ayadi Printing House.
- Shepherd, J.; Rossuer, R.; and Taylor, J. 1991. *Ways to Grammar*. London: Macmillan.
- Sledd, J. 1959. *A Short Introduction to English Grammar*. California: University of California Press.
- Smith, L. P. 1969. *The English Language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Spencer, A. 1991. *Word Structure*. Internet. [file : // A: / nominal% 20 affixes % 203. Htm.](#)

- _____. 1998. *The Handbook of Morphology*. Oxford: Basil Black Well.
- Stageberg, N. 1971. *An Introductory English Grammar*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.
- Swan, M. 1996. *Practical English Usage*. Oxford : Oxford University Press.
- Thomas, B. J. 1996. *Elementary Vocabulary*. London: Addison Wesley Longman Limited.
- _____. 2002. *Advanced Vocabulary and Idiom*. London: Addison. Wesley Longman. Limited.
- Toman, J. 1985. *A Discussion of Coordination and Word-Syntax*. Dordrecht: Kluwer, 407- 432.
- Trost, H. 2004. *Computational Morphology*. Internet. www.zrz.hu-Berlin.de/angl/ling-pages/morphology.htm
- Weir, C. 1993. *Understanding and Developing Language*. London: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- West, H. 1961. *The New Method English Dictionary*. London: Lowe and Bryson Press.
- Wiese, H. 1997. *Semantics of Nouns and Nominal Number*. London: Prentice-Hall.
- Yule, G. 1996. *The Study of Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- _____. 1998. *Explaining English Grammar*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Zandvoort, R. W. 1966. *A Handbook of English Grammar*. London: Longman.

Appendix I

The Test

Q1/ Write each word in group (A) and then choose the nominal suffix in group (B) that best matches it, making any necessary changes in spelling:

No	Group A: Words	Group B: Nominal Suffixes	Nouns
1-	likely	- sion	
2-	free	- ful	
3-	jealous	- al	
4-	marry	- ian	
5-	invite	- age	
6-	history	- ation	
7-	excite	- ship	
8-	arrive	- y	
9-	relation	- hood	
10-	spoon	-dom	
		-ment	
		-ness	

**2 / Fill in the blank with the most appropriate prefix:
[co-,ex-,non-,post-,mal-,uni-,sub-,over-,super-,tri-,pre-
, mono-]**

- 1- Some flights which go from London to the Middle East are called ----- stop.
- 2- She is divorced but she is on good terms with her----- husband.
- 3- Both men and women have their hair cut there. It's a-----sex salon.
- 4- He needs a good holiday .He is suffering from ----- work.
- 5- Small children ride ----- cycles, not bicycles.
- 6- Soldiers, policemen and firemen wear ----- form. Teachers do not.
- 7- The principal ----- war problem was to rebuild the destroyed cities.
- 8- That road is very dangerous. Use the ----- way to get a cross.
- 9- He is incredibly rich. He is certainly a -----millionaire.
- 10- The launch of the space rocket was delayed by ----- function in the fuel system.

Q3/ Put the words in brackets into the sentences in the correct order in their plural forms:

- 1- A large number of ----- fled in fear when a flock of ----- suddenly landed within a few ----- of them. (mouse, foot, goose)
- 2- Automobile ----- have all too many ----- to tell of ----- in deliveries of the special security ----- and are considering ways of manufacturing their own. (key, company, delay, story)
- 3 – The farmer’s ----- and some wild ----- were sometimes alarmed by low-flying ----- . (deer, sheep , aircraft)

Q4/ Derive nouns from the following words:

No.	Words	Nouns
1-	beautiful	
2-	long	
3-	lazy	
4-	advise	
5-	treat	
6-	deny	
7-	author	
8-	tiger	
9-	smoking	
10-	novel	

Q 5 / Put in each space a noun made from the words in brackets: (Do not use any form more than once)

1 – Please respect the ----- of this religious place by not talking loudly.

(holy)

2 – It was a long, slow film. I nearly died of ----- . (boring)

3 - ----- is one of the world's great problems. (poor)

4 – Tell the ----- . (true)

5 – His ----- in business was the result of hard work. (succeed)

6 – The tornado caused great deal of ----- . (destroy)

7 – The company will not hire you unless you have some ----- .

(efficient)

8 – He was punished because of his ----- . (fail)

9 – There should be ----- in any society. (just)

10 – The baby is crying because of ----- . (hungry)

Appendix II

The Test's Answers

Q1:

- 1- likelihood
- 2- freedom
- 3- jealousy
- 4- marriage
- 5- invitation
- 6- historian
- 7- excitement
- 8- arrival
- 9- relationship
- 10- spoonful

Q2:

- | | |
|----------|---------|
| 1- non | 2- ex |
| 3- co | 4- over |
| 5- tri | 6- uni |
| 7- post | 8- sub |
| 9- super | 10- mal |

Q3:

- 1- mice
- 2- geese
- 3- feet

4- companies

5- keys

6- stories

7- delays

8- sheep

9- deer

10 aircrafts

Q4:

1- beauty

2- length

3- laziness

4- advice

5- treatment

6- denial

7- authority, authorship

8- tigress

9- smoking, smoker

10- novelist, novelty

Q5:

1- holiness

2- boringdom

3- poverty

4- truth

5- success

6- destruction

7- efficiency

8- failure

9- justice

10- hunger

جامعة بابل

استقصاء المشاكل التي يواجهها طلبة الجامعة العراقيون الدارسون اللغة الإنجليزية لغة أجنبية في استعمال الإضافات الاسمية

رسالة تقدمت بها

إقبال خضير هاشم

إلى مجلس كلية التربية الأساسية في جامعة بابل وهي جزء من متطلبات
نيل درجة ماجستير في طرائق تدريس اللغة الإنجليزية لغة أجنبية
بإشراف

أ.م.د. رياض طارق العميدي د. عاصم عبود الدليمي

آب

2005

رجب

1426

الخلاصة

تناولت هذه الدراسة الإضافات الاسمية و أقسامها ووظائفها فتنقسم طبقا لموقعها في الكلمة على ثلاثة أقسام، القسم الأول الإضافات الأولية حيث تستعمل لتغيير معنى الاسم المضاف إليه، أما القسم الثاني فتكون الإضافات في وسط الكلمة وهذا القسم اقل شيوعا ويتمثل في بعض حالات الجمع الشاذ، أما القسم الأخير فهو الإضافات

النهائية وتكون على نوعين، النوع الأول أدوات الصرف المقيدة وتتمثل في الجمع والتملك أما النوع الآخر فيكون أكثر تعقيدا لأنه يشتمل على اشتقاق الاسم من الفعل والصفة وحتى الاسم نفسه.

إن هدف هذه الدراسة هو استقصاء الصعوبات التي يواجهها طلبة الجامعة العراقيون الدارسون اللغة الإنجليزية لغة أجنبية في التمييز واستعمال الإضافات الاسمية.

وقد افترضت الباحثة ما يأتي:

1- لا يميز طلبة الجامعة العراقيون الدارسون اللغة الإنجليزية لغة أجنبية الإضافات الاسمية وأقسامها المختلفة و وظائفها.

120

2- يواجه هؤلاء المتعلمون صعوبات في جمع الكلمات وإنتاج كتابة صحيحة خالية

119

من الأخطاء.

3- يتوقع أن تكون إجابات الطلبة الصحيحة في السياق أكثر من إجاباتهم في الكلمات المنفردة.

4- يحتمل أن تكون إجابات الطلبة الصحيحة في مستوى التمييز أفضل من إجاباتهم في مستوى الإنتاج.

وعلى أساس هذه الفرضيات صمم اختبار تشخيصي ونفذ على عينة متكونة من (150) طالبا من طلبة الكلية العراقيين الدارسين اللغة الإنجليزية لغة أجنبية في الصف الثالث من قسم اللغة الإنجليزية / كلية التربية، وقد وقع الاختبار على ثلاث جامعات: بابل، بغداد، القادسية. ومن خلال التحليل الإحصائي واللغوي لإجابات الطلبة لفقرات الاختبار تم الوصول إلى النتائج الآتية:

1- يواجه طلبة الجامعة الدارسون اللغة الإنجليزية لغة أجنبية صعوبات في التمييز و إنتاج الإضافات الاسمية حيث كانت النسبة الأعلى لإجاباتهم خاطئة (62.09%) كذلك لوحظ أن إجاباتهم الصحيحة في مستوى الإنتاج (31.50%) اقل من إجابتهم الصحيحة في مستوى التمييز (47.6%).

2- إن النسب العالية لأخطاء الطلبة تعكس عدم تمكنهم من جمع الأسماء المفردة (66.87%) والحصول على كتابة خالية من الأخطاء (68, 56 %).

3- إن النسب العالية لإجابات الطلبة الصحيحة في السياق (38.47%) تعكس أهمية السياق في الإجابة أما في الكلمات المفردة فيكون من الصعب على الطالب معرفة ما مطلوب منه لعدم وجود ترابط معنوي بين الكلمات (22,79%).

4- تنسب أخطاء الطلبة إلى الأسباب الآتية:

أ- استراتيجيات الاتصال (44.90%)

ب- استعمال الطلبة لاستراتيجيات التعلم لقواعد اللغة الإنجليزية في إنتاج الإضافات الاسمية (44.81%)

ج- سياق التعليم (7.58%)

2- تأثير لغة الأم (2.71%)

تقع هذه الدراسة في خمسة فصول كرس الفصل الأول منها لمناقشة مشكلة الدراسة والأهداف والفرضيات والإجراءات المتبعة وحدود البحث والفائدة من هذه الدراسة، أما الفصل الثاني فيتضمن عرضاً لأنواع الإضافات الاسمية ويشمل تعاريفها وأنواعها ووظائفها. أما الفصل الثالث فيتناول وصفاً للاختبار الذي أجرته الباحثة على طلبة الصفوف الثالثة من قسم اللغة الإنجليزية / كلية التربية في ثلاث جامعات: بابل، بغداد، القادسية. يتضمن هذا الوصف أهداف الاختبار وتصميمه واختيار المادة وصلاحيته وثقته والطلبة وأيضاً خطة احتساب الدرجة المعتمدة.

يتضمن الفصل الرابع نتائج الاختبار من وجهتي النظر الإحصائية واللغوية حيث حللت و شخّصت الأخطاء التي يقع فيها الطلبة، أما الفصل الأخير فيلخص النتائج التي توصلت إليها الدراسة والتي وضعت في ضوءها بعض المقترحات والمضامين التي لها علاقة في الجانب التعليمي.